DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 034 010 UD 009 321

AUTHOR	Fox, David J.; Weinberg, Emmeline
TITLE	Summer Schools for Junior High and Intermediate School Pupils. Evaluation of New York City Title I Educational Projects, 1966-67.
INSTITUTION	Center for Urban Education, New York, N.Y. Committee on Field Research and Evaluation.; City Coll. Research Foundation, New York, N.Y.
Spons Agency	New York City Board of Education, Brooklyn, N.Y.
Pub Date	Nov 67
Note	151p.
EDRS Price	EDRS Price MF-$0.75 HC-$7.65
Descriptors	Academic Achievement, Achievement Gains, *Cultural Enrichment, *Disadvantaged Youth, *Educational Retardation, Intermediate Grades, Junior High School Students, Mathematics Instruction, Negro Students, Reading Achievement, Reading Level, *Summer Programs, Teacher Aides
Identifiers	*Elementary Secondary Education Act Title I, ESEA Title I Programs, New York City

Abstract

This New York City school district educational project sought to produce changes in a positive direction in academic achievement, attitudes toward school, and educational and vocational aspirations of two groups of disadvantaged children. One group consisted of children from public and nonpublic schools who had difficulty in learning because of reading retardation or had failed specific subjects and who were recommended by their home school for summer remedial education. The second group consisted of children who had mastered the basic reading skills and had high academic potential interest; for these children, the program of the Creative Arts Academy was established. Of interest was the employment of 244 recent high school graduates living in poverty areas, as educational aides to assist classroom teachers. The overall evaluation of the program was consistently positive. Striking gains were obtained in both reading and mathematics. The Creative Arts Academy program was viewed by observers, staff, and children alike as a worthwhile and enjoyable experience. A comprehensive sample of interview and questionnaire forms used in the program is appended at the end of the report. (EM)

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

09321 E

Center for Urban Education
33 West 42nd Street
New York, New York 10036

ED034010

SUMMER SCHOOLS FOR JUNIOR HIGH AND INTERMEDIATE SCHOOL PUPILS

David J. Fox and Emmeline Weinberg

PROGRAM REFERENCE SERVICE
CENTER FOR URBAN EDUCATION

Evaluation of a New York City school district educational project funded under Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (PL 89-10), performed under contract with the Board of Education of the City of New York for the summer of 1967.

Conducted under subcontract by the City College Research Foundation.

UD 009321

Committee on Field Research and Evaluation
Joseph Krevisky, Assistant Director
George Weinberg, Title I Coordinator

November 1967

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

I INTRODUCTION

The Summer Junior High School Program 1

Objectives of the Program 3

School Organization 3

II EVALUATION PROCEDURES

Objectives of the Evaluation 6

Selection of Schools and Classes for Evaluation . . 6

Data Collection 8

Bases for Evaluation 10

Instruments 15

Analysis of Data 16

Orientation of Examiners and Observers 17

III FINDINGS

Implementation of the Objectives of the Proposal for the Summer Institutes 18

Quality of Instruction 21

Achievement in Reading 23

Achievement in Mathematics 30

School Staff Appraisal of the Program 34

Children's Appraisal of the Program 41

Appraisal of Children's Attitudes, Educational and Vocational Aspirations 42

TABLE OF CONTENTS (continued)

Page

Educational Aides 45

Attendance 50

IV CREATIVE ARTS ACADEMY

The Procedure 53

Findings 54

Recommendations 70

V CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS 72

APPENDIX A: Tables . . . .(Tables included in the text)

APPENDIX B: Instruments B1

APPENDIX C: Staff List C1

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

This is the report of an evaluation conducted during the summer of 1967 of the Summer School Program for Junior High School and Intermediate School Pupils under Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. The program was conducted in 11 New York City Schools in designated poverty areas.

The study was designed to evaluate the quality of the remedial instruction program in reading and mathematics, and to measure changes in achievement of public and nonpublic school children who had failed during the regular school year. One of the secondary concerns of the evaluation was to assess changes in pupil attitude towards school, and changes in their educational and vocational aspirations.

The Summer Junior High School Program

Summer Junior High Schools staffed by regularly assigned educational personnel have been in existence in all five boroughs of New York City for the past eight years. The program offers instruction during a five and one-half week period for all students who have failed specific subjects during the regular school year or who have not met the standards for promotion set by the Board of Education.

In 1967, 11 of the 22 summer schools serving 15,008 pupils were designated to receive federal support and called Summer Institutes.

These institutes included 11 schools,(10 junior high schools and one intermediate school) enrolling pupils from the poverty areas of four boroughs; Manhattan, Bronx, Brooklyn and Queens. In addition, a special Creative Arts Academy, located at the High School of Music and Art in Manhattan, was established. Public and nonpublic school pupils were eligible to participate.

In the Summer Institutes, students were given the opportunity to make up failure in credit subjects. The credit subjects offered during the school year were : English, mathematics, foreign languages,science, social studies, industrial arts, typing, and music. Two noncredit courses[1] in Reading, and English as a second language were included in the program in response to needs of the student population of the city schools.

In the Creative Arts Academy, a novel enrichment program was established to encourage creative experience in music, art, drama,and creative writing. Children reading on or near grade level were recruited on a citywide basis from public and nonpublic schools. The Academy provided a program of "majors" in listed subjects. The production of a literary magazine, a dramatic production, an art exhibit, and a performance by the orchestra and chorus were the culminating activities of the program.

---

[1] The courses in industrial arts, typing, music, and English as a second language were not offered in all institutes.

Objectives of the Program

The primary goal of the Summer School Program for Junior High School and Intermediate School Pupils was to produce changes in a positive direction in academic achievement, attitudes toward school, and educational and vocational aspirations of two groups of disadvantaged children. One group consisted of children from public and nonpublic schools who had had difficulty in learning because of reading retardation or who had failed specific subjects and were recommended by their home school for summer study. The second group consisted of children who had made satisfactory progress in schools, were reading on or near their grade level, and had high academic potential and interest; for these children, the program of the Creative Arts Academy was established.

School Organization

The school day consisted of three consecutive 90-minute periods. Teachers were assigned to all three periods of instruction and pupils were registered for one or two of these periods, arranged consecutively. Libraries, staffed by duly licensed librarians, were open from 8:00 A.M. to 12:30 P.M. or from 8:30 A.M. to 1:00 P.M., according to the individual school day.

A supervisor in charge of each Summer Institute had primary responsibility for the administration and supervision of the instructional program. Classes of approximately twenty pupils were taught by teachers licensed in the subjects offered.

One innovation of the summer program was the assignment of recent (June 1967) high school graduates living in poverty areas to assist classroom teachers by working with children on a one-to-one basis. Twenty-five persons were to be chosen from each of the communities served by a Summer Institute to work as educational aides.

Before the end of the summer, 244 educational aides were employed in the 11 institutes. They were paid two dollars per hour for a five and one-half hour school day. The six Title I schools in the sample were assigned 113 recent high school graduates as aides.

The eligibility requirements stated that "only those recent high school graduates who reside in highly impacted poverty areas, and who are in financial need to continue their education are eligible for such employment... They will be assigned to assist teachers on a one-to-one basis in academic subjects as well as music, art, typing and industrial arts."[2]

The office of the project coordinator was responsible for recruiting and interviewing aids recommended by Community Progress Centers and principals of the home schools, and assigning aides to schools that were closest to their residence. The duties of the aides were broadened to include many that were of assistance to the administrator of individual schools.

The Creative Arts Academy was under the supervision of a supervisor in charge and an assistant (a licensed principal and/or an assistant to principal) who were responsible for the administrative and instructional programs. General assistants (chairmen of departments), licensed in music, art and English language arts, assisted the principal in the instructional program. A licensed teaching staff provided instruction in instrumental and vocal music, fine arts, English language arts, typing, and industrial arts to classes of approximately twenty pupils. In addition, four artists, musicians, and news reporters living in the communities served as consultants to the program. Full use was to be made of the city's cultural resources through trips. Guest artists were to be invited to the school. A project coordinator was responsible for the overall supervision of the program.

---

[2] Directive from Staff Superintendent, June 1, 1967.

CHAPTER II

EVALUATION PROCEDURES

Objectives of the Evaluation

The evaluation of the summer program had five main objectives: (1) to describe the methods used to implement the objectives of the Summer Institutes; (2) to assess the quality of instruction; (3) to estimate the extent and direction of change in achievement in reading and mathematics, attitudes toward school, and the educational and vocational aspirations of the students in the program; (4) to discover the reactions of supervisors, teachers, and students to the summer program; and (5) to determine the initial and final pupil registers and attendance in remedial and enrichment subjects.

Selection of Schools and Classes for Evaluation

During the first week of the program, the principals of the 11 Summer Institutes were advised of the evaluation study and were requested to complete and return a census-registration form, indicating the subjects being given and the number of pupils registered for each. Copies of the school organization sheets, listing class and teaching assignments, were also requested at this time.

Six Summer Institutes were then selected for evaluation on the basis of three criteria: physical location by borough, total pupil enrollment, and range of subjects offered. The six included five junior high school Summer Institutes, one each in the Bronx, Manhattan, and Queens, and two in Brooklyn, and the only Intermediate School in the program. The schools offered a wide selection of credit and noncredit subjects on the sixth-, seventh- and eighth-grade levels. They varied in size, ranging from the smallest to the largest pupil register of the 11 federally funded schools.

Within the sample schools, 39 classes in reading and 33 classes in mathematics were selected to represent the different levels of pupil achievement shown on the school organization sheets and confirmed in telephone conversations with supervisors. Table 1 shows the number and location of schools in the program and in the sample of six, studied in this evaluation. Table 2 shows the number and location of reading and mathematics classes selected for study from this sample of six schools.

Table 1

Number and Location of Schools in the 11 Title I
Summer Institutes and in the Sample

Level and Borough	Total Number of Schools in Program*	Number of Schools in Sample
Junior		
Manhattan	2	1
Bronx	2	1
Brooklyn	5	2
Queens	1	1
Intermediate	1	1
Total	11	6

* "Location of Schools," Project Proposal, Summer Program for Junior High and Intermediate School Pupils. New York: New York City Board of Education, 1967.

Table 2

Number and Location of Reading and Mathematics Classes Selected for Study in the Sample Schools.

Level and Borough	Reading Classes		Mathematics Classes	
	Total Number of Classes in Sample	Number Selected for Study	Total Number of Classes in Sample	Number Selected for Study
Junior				
Manhattan	13	6	10	9
Bronx	10	6	4	4
Brooklyn	47	15	32	11
Queens	10	6	3	3
Intermediate	11	6	6	6
Total	91	39	55	33

Data Collection

The data were collected in three stages:

1. A two-day visit to each of the six sample schools was made during the first week of the summer program. On the first day, a team of two examiners[1] administered questionnaires to 559 children in the selected reading and mathematics classes and to educational aides assigned to each school. On the second day, the same team administered a standardized achievement test in mathematics to 664 pupils in the sixth, seventh, and eighth grades. At the request of the evaluation program coordinator,

---

[1] All examiners were graduate students in School Psychology programs. All had preparation and experience in group testing.

the scores on the standardized reading tests administered by the school staff during the first week of summer school were made available[2] and are used in this study as the pretest reading scores.

2. During the first week in August, each sample school was visited for two days by a team of two, an educator and a social scientist. Each observer independently visited three reading and mathematics classes, for a total of six classes in each school, or 36 classes in all. At different times during the two days, interviews were conducted with the principal, educational aides, and with ten pupils from each of the observed classes. Six guidance counselors and two reading consultants were interviewed independently by the team during this period. In addition, 67 questionnaires were mailed to the reading and mathematics teachers and to the 11 librarians assigned to the six schools. Self-addressed stamped envelopes were included with each questionnaire together with a letter requesting their return within three days. Teachers and librarians were assured that all information received would be treated as confidential and that all data would be reported in a manner to insure anonymity. Fifty-seven questionnaires were completed and returned by the teachers. All the librarians completed and returned their questionnaires.

3. Teams of two evaluators administered posttests to pupils during a two-to four-day period in the fifth week of the program.

---

[2] The evaluation staff is grateful to Mr. Bernard Fox, Administrator of the program, and to the supervisors and teachers involved, for making these data available.

The posttests included the standardized test in mathematics, intermediate and advanced level, which was administered to the pupils in the seventh and eighth grades who had received the pretest. Standardized achievement tests in reading were administered in those seventh- and eighth-grade classes where pretesting had been completed. In addition, questionnaires were readministered to 642 pupils and 87 educational aides.

Bases for Evaluation

The evaluation of the program had nine elements and involved 16 instruments.[3] The nine elements are discussed below:

1. Implementation of the Program: The school organization, instructional program and school population and personnel were described through two interviews with the project coordinator.[4] The staff coordinators for reading, mathematics, and educational aides were interviewed by a member of the evaluation team after the Summer Institutes had started. All information was recorded on a Coordinator's Interview Guide (Appendix B). Written directives to administrative staff, curriculum guides, and other communications with Summer Institute personnel were made available by the coordinator of the program.

---

[3] Copies of all instruments other than the standardized tests appear in Appendix B.

[4] These interviews were conducted by the Evaluation Project Director, Mrs. Weinberg.

Staff qualifications, licensing, educational background, job experience and responsibilities were determined through questionnaires and in personal interviews with special staff in the schools.

2. Quality of Instruction and Teacher-Child Functioning: Twelve observers, in teams of two, visited a total of 18 reading and 17 mathematics classes in six schools in a two-day visit during the fourth week of the program. Their observations of sixth-, seventh-, and eighth-grade classes were recorded on the Individual Lesson Observation Report, and provided information on the topic of the lesson, the quality of the lesson , and on 12 different aspects of teacher-child functioning. (See Appendix B.)

3. Achievement in Reading: Initial estimates of achievement for seventh-, eighth-, and ninth-grade students in the noncredit reading course were based on scores obtained on the Word Knowledge and Reading Comprehension subtests of the Metropolitan Achievement Test (MAT) in reading. The Intermediate level of the test, form CM, was administered during the first week by the reading staff of the Institutes. Initial scores were available for 1266 pupils.

After four weeks, form BM of the MAT in reading, Intermediate level, was administered to 620 children in 34 classes of five [5] schools by project staff. Complete pre- and posttest data were available for 479 pupils.

---

[5] One sample school was omitted from the analysis because of inconsistency in recording pupils' initial scores. One class was dropped from the original sample because of problems in administering the posttest.

The number of children who qualified for promotion certificates and diplomas was based on the reading levels set by the Board of Education.

4. Achievement in Mathematics: Pupils registered for the course in sixth-, seventh-, and eighth-grade mathematics were repeating the course because of failure during the regular school year. In order to receive credit for the course, the students had to pass a citywide final examination prepared for each of the two grade levels on topics from the second half of the course syllabus.

The computation subtest of the Metropolitan Achievement Test in arithmetic, intermediate and advanced levels, form BM, was used as a pretest to estimate achievement. The project staff administered the test during the first week of the session to 622 pupils in 34 classes. (One more class than originally planned for testing in Table 2.)

After four weeks, form CM of the test was administered by project staff to 539 pupils in the same 34 classes. Pre- and posttest scores were available for 339 pupils.

The number of pupils who passed the course and received promotional credit in sixth-, seventh-, and eighth-grade mathematics was determined from the final report of the Board of Education.

5. School Staff Appraisal of Program: The two-member team of observers jointly interviewed six principals and conducted individual personal interviews with the special staff. Six guidance couselors and two reading consultants (only two schools had reading consultants) were interviewed and their comments recorded on a special staff interview

guide. All program personnel interviewed were asked to rate the program, identify its strengths and weaknesses, and offer recommendations for change.

The school class schedule (three consecutive ninety-minute periods)did not permit individual interviews with the teaching staff without disruption of the school program. Therefore, questionnaires were sent to teachers of sixth-, seventh-, and eighth-grade reading and mathematics classes asking them to rate the program and its effects on the attitudes and academic achievement of the pupils. Opportunities were provided for a qualitative rating of the Summer Institutes Program.

The 11 librarians were also asked to comment, by questionnaire, on the available materials and use of their services by teachers and pupils, and on the reading program.

All members of the staff were asked to rate 12 aspects of the summer school program, including organization, instructional procedures and materials, availability of special staff, and school plant. Their ratings and comments were recorded in interview and questionnaire guides (Appendix B).

6. Children's Appraisal of the Program: Questionnaires were administered to pupils in sixth-, seventh-, and eighth-grade reading and mathematics classes by the members of the evaluation team during the first week of the program. The questionnaires could be understood by pupils reading at a third grade level. Reasons for attending and anticipatory feelings about the program were studied. The questionnaire was readministered during the fifth week of the program to assess change, if any, in reasons for attendance and opinion of the effectiveness of the program. Three hundred forty-nine paired pre- and postquestionnaires were used in the analysis of pupil ratings.

In addition, on the basis of the response to the first administration of the pupil questionnaire, five students from each reading class and five students from each mathematics class were selected to discuss their reactions to the program. The purpose of these discussions was to provide an estimate of the reliability of the answers to the pupil questionnaire and to offer the pupils an opportunity for free response. The team's social scientist led the discussion while the other team members recorded pupil responses.

7. Appraisal of Children's Attitudes, Educational and Vocational Aspirations: Two kinds of data were obtained on expectation of success, and educational and vocational aspirations. One consisted of ratings of pupils by guidance counselors and teachers (obtained in personal interviews and written questionnaires) during the fourth week of the summer program. The second was obtained from the pupils themselves at the beginning and end of the program. On the Pupil Questionnaire (Appendix B) they indicated their job preference, and their plans and desires to continue in school, as well as their attitudes toward the summer program. Pre- and posttest results for a matched sample of 349 pupils were analyzed for level and change in attitudes, and educational and vocational aspirations.

8. Educational Aides: The functioning and effectiveness of the educational aides was evaluated indirectly through opinions elicited from the six principals, 47 teachers, and six guidance counselors in interviews

and questionnaires. This component of the program was also evaluated through questionnaires administered to 102 aides during the first week of the Summer Institutes and to 92 aides during the fifth week of the program. Forty-six matched pre- and postquestionnaires were analyzed. In addition, a member of the observation team conducted discussions with the educational aides in each of the six sample schools during the third week. The aides recorded their own answers to questions discussed in the group session. The consistency of their responses on different measures helped establish the reliability of the educational aides questionnaire.

9. Attendance: Attendance records were obtained from the Board of Education's Bureau of Attendance. The final attendance records were summarized in the report of the coordinator of the summer program,which is included in Appendix A.

Instruments

Sixteen instruments were used in this study. The observers completed the following:

1. Individual Lesson Observation Record
2. Principals' Interview Guide
3. Reading Consultant Interview Guide
4. Guidance Counselor Interview Guide
5. Interviewers' Qualitative Report

The children completed the following:

1. Pupil Prequestionnaire
2. Pupil written form after discussion
3. Pupil Postquestionnaire
4. Metropolitan Achievement Tests in Reading
5. Metropolitan Achievement Tests in mathematics

The educational aides completed the following:

1. Educational Aide Prequestionnaire
2. Educational Aide written form after discussion
3. Educational Aide Postquestionnaire

The Evaluation team completed a School Qualitative Report at the beginning and end of the program.

Analysis of Data

In general, achievement data collected from the Summer Institutes were analyzed and will be reported both by school and by the combined responses for the five schools that constituted the reading sample, and the six schools that made up the mathematics sample. All data collected from supervisory, teaching, and special staff were grouped and reported as an overall evaluation of the six summer institutes.

Data collected from instruments administered to pupil and educational aides were also grouped and reported for the combined school sample only.

Throughout the study, only data from children who completed both pre- and posttests (or postquestionnaires) were used to evaluate changes in pupil achievement,attitudes,and educational and vocational aspirations.

Orientation of Examiners and Observers

Special directions were given to examiners at two orientation sessions. They were instructed to explain the reason for the study and the role of the pupil in the evaluation, emphasizing the importance of the pupils' contribution.

Two days for initial and final testing were used to familiarize the pupil with the testing team. On the first day, the pupil questionnaires and the questionnaires to educational aides were administered in all the schools. On the second day, the achievement tests were given according to the directions in the testing manual.

One orientation session was held for the observers. Special directions were given for the administration of the discussion guide in interviews with pupils and educational aides to support and encourage the expression of their personal opinions.

CHAPTER III

FINDINGS

In this chapter, data will be presented for each of the nine elements of evaluation discussed in Chapter II.

1. Implementation of the Objectives of the Proposal for the Summer Institutes

The prevailing practices of the Summer Institutes with regard to staffing, selection of pupil population, and instructional program as an extension of the school year, were in accord with the objectives and practices stated in the project proposal. An examination of the reports on administrative organization, curriculum, and instructional methods and materials obtained in interviews and in writing from the project coordinators supported the conclusion that this summer institute program and the regular summer school program were virtually identical. The two differences were the fiscal support and the assignment of guidance counselors and educational aides to the 11 schools.

The project coordinator was responsible for all ten non-Title I summer junior high schools, for the 11 Title I Summer Institutes, and for the Creative Arts Academy. The coordinator arranged for the number and location of the summer institutes, hired all staff, ordered materials, and assumed full responsibility for the ongoing program.

Materials: The budget for materials of instruction was limited by the project coordinator, who indicated in a personal interview that he preferred "to use the money for staffing," rather than for instructional materials. Principals were advised to borrow materials from their home schools whenever possible. Therefore, the quantity and quality of materials varied from school to school and between the reading and the mathematics program. When asked to evaluate the materials available for the reading program, four of the principals indicated in interviews and questionnaires that the supply of materials was "adequate" or "more than adequate". Four other principals thought they were "less than adequate". Five principals stated that the limited materials that could be ordered did not arrive in time.

Teachers were also asked to rate the quality of the reading materials. Of the teachers, 65 per cent thought the materials were "very good" or "basically satisfactory", while 26 per cent thought they needed "some" or "considerable" revision. The two reading consultants stated that the materials arrived late, and felt that there was not an adequate supply of them.

The quality and adequacy of the mathematics materials was evaluated in interviews with six principals and in questionnaires from 22 teachers. Five principals said that the materials arrived in time, but one said that they arrived late. Most teachers felt that the materials were adequate; 64 per cent rated the materials "basically satisfactory" or "very good, as is." Thirty-six per cent felt they needed revision.

Staff: All principals in the six sample schools were licensed and qualified. All had at least five years' experience as a principal; five of the six principals were serving as summer school principals for the first time; the sixth, for a second summer.

Eighty-three per cent of the teachers in the sample schools were licensed in their subject area and were experienced teachers. Thirty-one of the 35 reading teachers were qualified English teachers. Thirteen of them had one to five years of experience, while 22 of them had between six and 15 years of experience; the mean was five years' experience. Sixteen of the 22 mathematics teachers were licensed to teach mathematics; six of them were teaching out-of-license. They had a mean of five and one-half years of experience.

The teachers' questionnaire guide, completed by all (35) reading teachers and all (22) mathematics teachers, asked how they viewed their responsibilities with regard to the special needs of their pupils. The responses varied from school to school, but 87 per cent indicated that the primary responsibility was to teach skills. Only 21 per cent of the teachers included within their responsibilities, "the need to build up confidence in the child, motivate for learning, and give guidance."

Physical Facilities and School Atmosphere: Both the observers and the examiners who visited the sample schools rated the physical facilities as satisfactory. With the exception of one school that showed signs of poor housekeeping, all were described as clean and tidy. The school atmosphere was generally rated as pleasant and warm, and conducive to learning. In the opinion of the observers, the supervisory staff in four schools was concerned with the needs of their teachers and children. In one school, the observers noted that the supervisor's staff was concerned with administrative matters, and in another school the staff was rated as not deeply committed to the program.

2. Quality of Instruction

The quality of instruction was evaluated by the team of educators who visited the sample summer institutes during the fourth week of the program. Eighteen reading classes and 17 mathematics classes in these schools were observed for a minimum of 45 minutes each.

The observers rated the degree of teacher planning and implementation in four areas especially important for children who have experienced failure: the relationship of the lesson to the child's own experience and background; the use of materials that involve many senses and activities that reinforce language and communication skills; the active involvement of the child in the learning process; and reinforcement by encouragement of pupil's initiative rather than by mere repetition or drill. (See Individual Lesson Observation Report, Appendix B.)

In addition, individual ratings were made of pacing of lesson, grouping for instruction, and teacher flexibility. Finally, the overall quality of the lesson and the degree of children's interest and enthusiasm were rated.

The findings will be summarized by presenting the modal (most frequent) ratings given to reading and mathematics classes on each of the criteria mentioned above.

Reading: All reading classes that were studied followed the plan prescribed by the reading coordinator with respect to materials used by the teacher. Eight of 13 lessons were rated as showing at least "some" evidence of planning and organization, and 12 of 18 lessons were rated as offering the child an opportunity to relate his own experiences to the lesson, to build on earlier learning, and to apply his learning to future lessons. In half of the lessons, the use of materials was rated as "creative and effective", and in the other half the rating was "little or no use" of materials.

Almost all (17 of 18) classes were taught as an entire group, with teacher-child interaction balanced (neither teacher- nor child-dominated). In half of the observed classes, there was some effort to pace instruction to accommodate slow learners, but in 10 of 18 classes, little effort in pacing instruction was observed.

In a large majority (14 of 18) of reading lessons, teachers were rated as encouraging pupil initiative and questions, and in most classes (12 of 18), children did volunteer in response to teachers' questions. Moreover, children were usually (8 of 18) considered "above average" in interest and enthusiasm, and (13 of 18) indicated pupils as being orderly and well behaved.

Mathematics: Here, too, classes were described as being organized with two-thirds of the classes rated as showing at least "some" evidence of organization and planning. Unlike the reading lessons, the mathematics lessons were generally (11 of 17) rated as remote and unrelated to children's experience. Less than half of the classes (six) referred to earlier experiences, and eight of the classes offered some foundation for future lessons. Use of materials and aids was rarely (5 of 17) observed.

All but two of the 17 lessons involved the class as a total group, and 8 of 17 were rated as teacher-dominated. Classes were rated as moderately paced, with efforts made to vary instruction to some extent (9 of 17).

Teachers generally (10 of 17) did not encourage pupil initiative, and consequently, in only one-third of the mathematics classes, did as many as half the children volunteer. Similarly, the classes' interest and enthusiasm was most often (10 of 17) rated "average" with interest in another third of the classes (5 of 17) rated "below average" or "extremely poor". While children in 11 of 17 classes were considered well-behaved, this was attributed to teacher-imposed discipline.

Overall Quality of Instruction: Twelve (68 per cent) of the reading classes received an overall rating of "average" or "better than average", as did 11 (75 per cent) of the mathematics classes. Five classes in each subject area were rated as "below average". When the observers rated a class as "better than average," they described the teacher as being skilled, motivated, and involving the student actively in the lesson, by individualizing instruction. When the observers rated a class as "below average", they described the teacher as being "unskilled, boring, abusive, and threatening, and not involving children actively in the lesson".

3. Achievement in Reading

The instructional program in reading was a highly structured skills program, with detailed directives spelled out for every part of the 90-minute period of instruction. Each teacher received a teaching manual from the reading coordinator. The topics were specifically described for the Basic Reading Program (BRP) for pupils reading below the 3.5 level; the Intensive Reading Program (IRP) for students reading from 3.6 to 5.5.; and the Enriched Program, an extension of the IRP, for students reading above the level of 5.5. The Enriched Program did not have a teacher's manual as yet, because the revised edition was not available.

The instructional program, four weeks of daily intensive reading instruction for 90-minute periods, was the equivalent of eight weeks or two months of formal instruction during the regular school year .

The reading program that was developed attempted to provide for the wide range of individual differences by homogeneous grouping regardless of grade. The Basic Reading Program emphasized skills and mechanics of reading. Those who had mastered these beginning skills were enrolled in the Intensive Reading Program. For the small percentage reading on or above grade level, the Enrichment Program was established.

A total of 479 students took both the pretest and posttest forms of the Metropolitan Achievement Tests, administered four weeks apart. The grade equivalents for the pretest are shown in Table 3 and for the posttest in Table 4.

As the program began, four out of every five students enrolled in the Summer Institutes were reading below grade level, and 18 per cent were reading on or above grade level. Citywide, nearly 39 per cent of seventh and eighth graders were reading below grade level. Forty-seven per cent of the pupils in the five sample schools were severely retarded, reading below grade five. For the total pupil population, all schools combined, the median reading grade on the pretest was 5.1.

Table 3

Children Reading at Indicated Grade Level,

on the Initial Administration of the MAT in Reading,

By School

(Percentage Distribution)

		Grade Equivalent Scores							
		Below Grade Level				On or Above Grade Level			
School	N	3.0- 3.9	4.0- 4.9	5.0- 5.9	6.0 6.9	7.0 7.9	8.0- 8.9	9.0 9.9	10.0+
A	68	16	19	26	25	7	4	1	0
B	106	19	37	10	7	12	5	8	3
C	80	19	14	20	21	12	9	4	1
D	55	33	16	18	22	7	0	2	2
E	170	24	29	23	11	6	5	4	1
Total	479	22	25	20	15	8	5	4	1

Table 4

Children Reading at Indicated Grade Level,

on the Final Administration of the MAT in Reading,

By School

(Percentage Distribution)

		Grade Equivalent Scores							
		Below Grade Level				On or Above Grade Level			
School	N	3.0- 3.9	4.0- 4.9	5.0- 5.9	6.0- 6.9	7.0- 7.9	8.0- 8.9	9.0- 9.9	10.0+
A	68	12	15	28	13	16	13	3	0
B	106	15	24	21	7	13	8	8	4
C	80	12	21	25	18	14	6	2	1
D	55	18	20	18	18	13	9	2	2
E	170	21	18	29	12	9	6	2	2
Total	479	17	20	25	13	12	8	3	2

Table 5 presents the means, standard deviations, and medians of the 479 students by school on both the pre- and the posttest. As is apparent from the table, gains were achieved in each of the Summer Institutes studied, using either the mean or median as referent. For all pupils in the five sample institutes, the mean gain was .3 years, and the median gain was .4 years.

Table 5

Mean and Median Reading Level for each sample school or both administrations of the MAT

(N = 479)

		Pre-Test			**Post-Test**		
School	**N**	**$\bar{X}$**	**Median**	**SD**	**$\bar{X}$**	**Median**	**SD**
A	68	5.5	5.5	1.41	6.0	6.0	1.59
B	106	5.5	4.9	2.00	5.9	5.4	2.00
C	80	5.6	5.7	1.63	5.8	5.7	1.57
D	55	5.1	5.1	1.72	5.7	5.7	1.79
E	170	5.2	4.9	1.68	5.5	5.4	1.67
Total	479	5.4	5.1	1.73	5.7	5.5	1.74

Table 6 presents the number and percentages of pupils in each school who "improved" in score, exhibited "no change", and "regressed" from the pre- to the posttest. Two hundred eighty-two pupils (59 per cent) of the 479 showed improvement in reading, 24 pupils (5 per cent) showed no change, and 173 pupils (36 per cent) showed regression.

Table 6

Number and Percentage of Pupils showing changes in reading level by school

		Number Who			Of Those Who Changed Per Cent Who	
School	**N**	**Increased**	**Did Not Change**	**Decreased**	**Increased**	**Decreased**
A	68	42	4	22	66	34
B	106	58	6	42	58	42
C	80	48	0	32	60	40
D	55	40	2	13	75	25
E	170	94	12	64	59	41
Total	479	282	24	173	62	38

In each sample institute at least 58 per cent and as many as 75 per cent of those who changed exhibited an increase in score.

The 282 pupils who showed an increase in score gained a median of .94 years, almost a full year. The 173 pupils who showed a decrease in reading achievement score had a median loss of .69 of a year.

Substantial gains were made by the most severely retarded pupils, those in the Basic Reading Program and the Intensive Reading Program. Of the students enrolled in the Enrichment Program -- an extension of the Intensive Reading Program -- none gained, and these children lost from four and one-half months to over a year as measured by a standardized reading test. Table 7 summarizes the change from pre- to posttests by initial level of achievement based on pretest scores.

Table 7

Mean and Median Differences in Reading by Grade equivalent Intervals based on Pretest Scores

Grade Equivalent Intervals based on scores	N	Differences from Pre- to Posttest	
		Mean	Median
3.0 - 3.9	103	+.81	.60
4.0 - 4.9	125	+.53	.40
5.0 - 5.9	97	+.31	.21
6.0 - 6.9	71	+.53	.28
7.0 - 7.9	40	-.08	-.45
8.0 - 8.9	17	-.88	-.92
9.0+	26	-.84	-.85
Total	479		

Reading progress was also measured by the extent to which grade promotional standards and certificate requirements were met. Overall promotional levels or certificate requirements were met by 62 per cent of the sample pupils. Specifically, 67 students (24 per cent) achieved the reading grade of 5.7 required for promotion to grade 8; 53 (17 per cent) achieved the reading grade of 6.2 required for promotion to grade 9; 58 (21 per cent) achieved the required reading grade of 5.8 for the eighth-year junior high school certificate. No children were qualified for a ninth-grade diploma.

In summary, those students (82 per cent of the sample) who were reading below grade level on the pretest, gained, as measured by a standardized reading test administered toward the end of the Summer Institute Program.

Those students (18 per cent) who were initially reading on or above grade level, regressed, as measured by a standardized reading test administered at the end of the program year.

If the assumption is made that the standardized test scores accurately measure the reading ability of this atypical population, the following conclusions may be made:

The Corrective Reading Program, which emphasized the basic reading skills, produced the largest gains in children who were the most severely retarded. This was accomplished by an experienced staff of teachers in extended periods of instruction with a highly detailed plan of instruction.[1]

---

[1] See Materials of Instruction -- Reading Coordinator, Summer Junior High School Program, in Appendix A.

The Enrichment Program, an extension of the Intensive Reading Program, did not serve the needs of its pupil population as well as did the corrective program.

4. Achievement in Mathematics

The mathematics program was not a remedial one but a repetition of the regular school course of study. The syllabi for the sixth, seventh and eighth grades were retaught. In the summer program for the sixth grade, the first half of the regular year's course was taught; in the seventh and eighth grades, the stress was on the work of the second half of the regular year.

In order to estimate levels of achievement, the evaluation staff administered form B of the Intermediate and Advanced Levels of the computation subtest of the Metropolitan Achievement Test during the first week of the program to 602 students in the six sample schools. After four weeks, form C of the Metropolitan Achievement Test was administered to 539 pupils in the same classes. The sample studied for achievement in mathematics was made up of 339 students for whom both pre- and posttest scores were available.

Table 8 summarizes the pretest scores of the seventh- and eighth-grade pupils. Eighty-five per cent of the sample students in the Summer Institutes had scores below grade level in computation; 15 per cent were functioning on or about grade level. Parallel data from the posttest administration is presented in Table 9. The proportion at or above grade level had increased to 28 per cent.

Table 8

Pupils below or above grade level on the initial administration of the MAT in Arithmetic, Advanced Level[a]
(Percentage Distribution)

		Grade Equivalent Scores							
		Below Grade Level				On or Above Grade Level			
School	N	3.0-3.9	4.0-4.9	5.0-5.9	6.0-6.9	7.0-7.9	8.0-8.9	9.0-9.9	10.0
A	38	5	18	32	37	3	5	0	0
B	115	7	12	35	26	15	3	1	1
C	38	8	24	40	16	10	3	0	0
D	35	14	20	23	17	14	9	3	0
E	55	5	33	42	15	5	0	0	0
F	58	0	22	33	29	3	12	0	0
Total	339	6	20	35	24	9	5	1	0

[a] The 50 students taking the intermediate level test are not included in this table.

Table 9

Pupils below or above grade level on the initial administration of the MAT in Arithmetic, Advanced Level[a]
(Percentage Distribution)

		Grade Equivalent Scores							
		Below Grade Level				On or Above Grade Level			
School	N	3.0-3.9	4.0-4.9	5.0-5.9	6.0-6.9	7.0-7.9	8.0-8.9	9.0-9.9	10.0
A	38	3	13	26	39	8	8	3	0
B	115	3	9	25	30	17	13	3	1
C	38	8	18	29	26	5	13	0	0
D	35	0	29	11	20	17	20	0	3
E	55	4	22	42	18	9	5	0	0
F	58	0	12	21	33	14	14	0	7
Total	339	3	15	26	28	13	12	1	2

[a] The 50 students taking the intermediate level test are not included in this table.

Table 10 summarizes for each school and for the total group the pre- and posttest medians, means, and standard deviations. Whether the mean or median is used as the referent, the children in the mathematics program at each institute gained about .5 of a year, although about 54 per cent of the students were still more than two years below grade level.

Table 10

Mean and Median Scores of the MAT in Arithmetic

Pre- and Posttest, by School

		Pretest			Posttest		
School	N	$\bar{X}$	Median	SD	$\bar{X}$	Median	SD
A	38	5.7	5.8	1.07	6.2	6.2	1.24
B	115	5.9	5.8	1.27	6.5	6.2	1.33
C	38	5.5	5.2	1.15	5.8	5.4	1.44
D	35	5.8	5.6	1.65	6.4	6.2	1.65
E	55	5.2	5.0	.96	5.6	5.3	1.16
F	55	5.8	5.8	1.30	6.6	6.5	1.54
Total	339	5.7	5.6	1.26	6.2	6.1	1.43

Table 11 shows the direction and extent of change in the scores of seventh- and eighth-grade pupils. Note that the vast majority of students exhibited an increase in score. For those who gained, the median amount was .68 of a year; the median loss for those who regressed was .23 of a year.

Table 11

Number and Percentage of pupils showing changes in mathematics level by school

School	N	Number Who Increased	Number Who Did Not Change	Number Who Decreased	Of Those Who Changed Per Cent Who Increased	Of Those Who Changed Per Cent Who Decreased
A	38	26	5	7	79	21
B	115	89	11	15	86	14
C	38	25	8	5	83	17
D	35	31	2	2	94	6
E	55	35	6	14	71	29
F	58	48	5	5	91	9
Total	339	254	37	48	84	16

Table 12 summarizes the differences between test administrations for the pupils based on their grade equivalent scores on the pretest. Unlike the results obtained in the analysis of reading scores, the median difference between mathematics test scores show little variation at the different intervals. The highest gains were made by children working on grade level or one year below grade level.

Promotion with a passing grade of 65, or with special permission and a grade of 50-64, was met by 57 per cent of all students, by 57 per cent of the students in the sixth grade, by 50 per cent of the students in the seventh grade, and by 58 per cent of the students in grade eight.

In summary, 75 per cent of the pupils participating in the mathematics program showed positive gains in computational achievement as measured by a standardized test. The overall median gain for the sample pupils in the six schools was five months.

Table 12

Mean Differences in Mathematics

Of Seventh and Eighth Grade Pupils by grade

equivalent intervals based on pretest scores

Grade Equivalent Intervals based on Pretest Scores	N	Difference Pre- to Posttest	
		Mean	Median
3.0 - 3.9	21	+.58	+ .57
4.0 - 4.9	69	+.41	+ .35
5.0 - 5.9	117	+.45	+ .47
6.0 - 6.9	80	+.62	+ .61
7.0 - 7.9	32	+.68	+ .70
8.0+	20	+.45	+ .40
Total	339		

5. School Staff Appraisal of the Program

The staff reaction to this program was assessed in interviews and written questionnaires. All principals in the 11 Title I schools were requested to evaluated the program; the principals in the six sample schools were interviewed, and the other five principals completed the mailed interview guide. Two of the latter five principals returned the guide, for a total of eight principals' completed interview guides.

Fifty-seven reading and mathematics teachers and the 11 librarians also completed questionnaires in which they evaluated the program. The six guidance counselors and two reading consultants were interviewed in person.

Overall Teacher Rating of the Program: Eighty-six per cent of the teaching staff felt that the students had benefitted from the summer-program; 14 per cent felt they had not. Thirty-two of the 35 reading teachers and 21 of the 22 teachers of mathematics said that "some but not all" of their students had benefitted.

The large majority of reading teachers rated the summer program as "very good" (7 per cent) or"basically satisfactory" (81 per cent). Only two-thirds of the mathematics teachers gave it a "very good" (14 per cent) or "basically satisfactory" (50 per cent) rating. The others wanted "considerable" or complete revision. Additional indication of the differential evaluation by the reading and mathematics teachers is that not one reading teacher felt the program needed to be "entirely revised or changed", while three (14 per cent) of the 22 mathematics teachers did.

Ratings of Organizational Aspects: Seven of the eight principals who responded thought class size was "very good" or "basically satisfactory", and only one felt a need for considerable revision. Fifty-four per cent of reading teachers and 14 per cent of mathematics teachers felt class size was satisfactory; 37 per cent of those responding felt classes were too large.

Six principals found the double 90-minute period of instruction "satisfactory", as did 63 per cent of the reading teachers and 41 per cent of the mathematics teachers. The other staff felt the periods were too long for the students.

Seven principals, 92 per cent of the reading teachers, and one reading consultant approved of the reclassification of pupils in homogenous groups (crossing grade levels for seventh- and eighth-grade students). The broad range of abilities in the heterogeneous mathematics classes was favored by four principals (three felt it needed revision). Almost twice as many mathematics teachers rejected heterogeneous grouping (65 per cent) as found it satisfactory (35 per cent).

Communication between school staff and special staff (reading consultants, guidance counselors and librarians) was rated as satisfactory by 62 per cent of the teachers. Approximately twenty per cent of the teachers felt that communication needed revision, and 20 per cent did not voice an opinion. The specialists themselves felt they needed more time during the school day to meet with the teachers.

The scheduling of the school day did not permit many trips, although provision for trips was included in the project proposal. The two principals who scheduled trips for the class felt that the trip program was very good. The overwhelming majority of the teachers offered no opinion since their program included no trips.

Librarians felt that the library program was limited,because the short school day did not permit full utilization of the library before or after school hours. When teachers scheduled this activity, library skills were taught. The librarians felt that teachers used the library "to some extent". No books were lent to students for home use, because of fear of possible loss of books.

Guidance counselors felt that their own role in the program was not clearly defined and expressed a need for orientation and a guidance coordinator. Although they provided educational and vocational advice to a few students, group guidance sessions were not developed.

Strengths and Weaknesses of the Summer Institute Program: All personnel concerned with the administrative or instructional aspects of the Summer Institutes were given the opportunity to evaluate the strengths and weaknesses of the program in interviews and in questionnaires. The majority of the staff did complete these questions, and responses were received from 48 (84 per cent) of the teachers in the sample, all eight principals, all eleven librarians, all six guidance counselors and the two reading consultants. In addition, interviews were held with the special coordinators in charge of the program at the Board of Education.

The major strengths of the program noted by the special reading coordinator were: the structured program, the double period, the high pupil motivation and good teacher morale, and the small class registers. The special coordinator of mathematics saw the program as an opportunity to make up failure or improve children's understanding under the guidance of an experienced teacher.

The special coordinator of educational aides felt that the greatest strength lay in the use of students from the community as aides. Aides helped by assuming paraprofessional, clerical, and patrol duties. Bilingual aides were particularly helpful in Spanish-speaking neighborhoods.

Guidance staff and librarians described the strengths of the program in terms of the services they could offer. Four of the six guidance counselors saw the opportunity to offer individual counseling to children and meet with parents and teachers as the major strengths of the program. Eight per cent of the librarians saw the library service as an opportunity for children to read and browse in a quiet area on their own; four of the 11 librarians thought that assistance to students in research was also important and four thought that training in library skills was important.

For the supervisors and teachers, the strengths of the program were mainly the opportunity to learn (mentioned by seven supervisors and 11 teachers), the high pupil motivation (four supervisors and 15 teachers), the competence and empathy of teaching and supervisory staff (four supervisors and 11 teachers), and the opportunity for individual attention (15 teachers).

The major weakness was thought to be insufficient time to plan and organize the program. All of the planning staff at the Board of Education agreed that there was insufficient time for planning the program. (The Project coordinator and the three staff coordinators in reading and mathematics as well as the educational aides, were notified on June 1st of the allotment of federal funds for the program.) Similarly, the time for preplanning was rated by five supervisors as insufficient for adequate organization and preparation. Four librarians felt that they lacked adequate preplanning time to set up a library program, and six of the teachers felt that this was a weakness. A weakness related to insufficient time was the lack of orientation and definition of the roles of guidance counselors and the coordinator of the educational aides. Library services were limited by the short school day, by the limitation of the use of the library books (in school only), and by few books suited to the reading level of the students.

The supervisory and teaching staff, in the majority of the Summer Institutes, was concerned with the time schedule and instructional period, the instructional materials, the grouping procedures, and the lack of articulation with the home school. Two supervisors and 14 teachers felt that the school day was too short, and/or that they had insufficient time for preparation and conferences. Fourteen teachers felt that the 90-minute period was too long for effective instruction, a weakness that no supervisor noted. Two supervisors and 11 teachers felt that equipment and instructional materials were inadequate, and nine teachers felt that the classes were either too large or too heterogenous.

Suggestions for improvement centered about the major weaknesses of the program. The coordinators at the Board of Education stressed the instructional aspects of the program. The reading coordinator suggested a special instructional program for better readers which would include better materials, machines for improving the rate of reading, and stress on study skills. In addition, the reading coordinator recommended an increased allotment for materials and recommended the acquisition of specific materials. The coordinator also suggested innovative programs for small numbers of students, such as use of the Initial Teaching Alphabet or the Responsive Environment Program. The mathematics coordinator suggested that the program provide corrective mathematics classes for children functioning below grade level and a continuation of the current course of study for those failing the course. A reduction in class size was recommended, as was an increase in the number of educational aides.

According to the aide coordinator, earlier recruitment of aides would help to reach the goal of providing one aide for every teacher in the program. Orientation in the assigned school for both teacher and aide would also improve the program. This orientation should define the role of the aide.

The guidance counselors recommended the assignment of a coordinator at the Board of Education and a clear definition of their duties. The need to provide time within the school day for guidance activities for both teacher and pupil was also suggested.

The librarians recommended an extension of library services to permit circulation of books for home use by the pupil, and also noted the need for a school day that enabled both teachers and students to use the library.

The recommendations of supervisors showed little consistency, with the exception of the recommendation for more preparation time and time to meet with teachers. Other recommendations included a summer institute in each district, an enriched program for children interested in advancement, and a broader curriculum.

The main changes suggested by the responding teachers involved shortening the instructional period and lengthening the summer session. Better materials of instruction, a flexible course of study and reduced class size were suggested.

6. Children's Appraisal of the Program

A study of pupil attitudes and aspirations was based on a sample of 198 boys and 158 girls. They ranged in age from 11 to 16 years, with a mean age of 12.8 years. Two-thirds of these pupils had never before attended summer school. One-third of the students were enrolled in both reading and mathematics courses.

Sixty-three per cent of the students said that they enrolled in the program to improve their work in school, especially in reading. About one-third (31 per cent) enrolled because they had to pass a course.

At the beginning of the program very positive attitudes toward summer school were expressed by 94 per cent of the students. They were confident that the summer program would help them "do better in school" and "help them pass their school subjects". This attitude was maintained throughout the program, and by the fifth week, 87 per cent of the children felt that summer school did help them.

The majority of reading pupils (86 per cent) said that their teacher had been the most helpful person in the program by explaining school work until it was understandable. In mathematics a slightly smaller majority (78 per cent) expressed this view.

Pupils preferred summer school to regular school because it was quieter and more relaxed. They felt that the teachers were nicer,less strict, and gave more attention and help to the students. Those who did not like summer school felt that the periods were too long and that it was too hot in school.

In answer to the question, "Would you go to summer school again if you could?" 50 per cent replied they would, and 30 per cent said they would not because they "didn't like it and were tired and sick of it". Some of the 30 per cent who said they would not go again gave no reason for their choices. The remaining children indicated they would not have to go because they would pass their courses.

7. Appraisal of Children's Attitudes, Educational and Vocational Aspirations:

Children were asked two questions about their educational aspirations - the schooling they would like to achieve,and the schooling they believed they would actually complete. The examiners made special efforts to make this distinction clear at the time of administration of the instrument.

Initially, 71 per cent of students indicated a desire to attend college and another 25 per cent a desire to complete a high school program. Moreover, 71 per cent of the students planned to complete a college program and 24 per cent to complete high school. The posttest showed a slight drop (5 per cent) in the proportion of pupils planning to complete college and a 5 per cent increase in the proportion who planned to complete high school.

About 40 per cent of the pupils on the initial administration, and 43 per cent of the pupils on the final administration of the pupil questionnaire indicated that they wished to have professional careers (doctor, lawyer, or teacher). About 20 per cent on the final questionnaire indicated that they wished to enter civil service or clerical jobs, and about 10 per cent wanted skilled or semi-skilled jobs. About 20 per cent of the respondents were "undecided", not surprising for twelve-year-old students.

Given the opportunity to describe that job they thought they would actually have when they completed school, students generally mentioned the same jobs as those they wanted, except that about 10 per cent fewer listed professional careers.

Staff Appraisal of Children's Attitudes and Aspirations: Written questionnaires, completed by 57 per cent of the reading and mathematics teachers, and interviews with six guidance counselors and six principals provided information on staff appraisal of children's attitudes and aspirations. Most of the respondents reported that they had time during the 90-minute class period for individual conferences or small group instruction. Almost all of the reading teachers talked with students during class; fewer (15) mathematics teachers did.

Reported student attitudes toward school, students' expectations of success in school, and students' educational and vocational aspirations were viewed differently by reading and mathematics teachers, although all teachers felt that rating pupils' vocational aspirations was difficult.

The majority of reading teachers (58 per cent) felt that most students had positive attitudes toward school and positive expectations of success in school. Mathematics teachers expressed opinions more in accord with stereotyped opinions about disadvantaged children. For the most part, negative views of student attitudes toward school and success in school were expressed, the one exception being that 50 per cent of the teachers who answered felt that the children had positive educational aspirations.

Extent of Change in Attitudes: Estimates of the extent of change in students' attitudes and aspirations was a harder task. Although the students' positive attitudes and aspirations were supported by teachers of reading, one-third of the responses indicated "no change or no response". One-half of the teachers did note change in some students' expectation of success in school, while 18 felt that there was no change in aspirations. Two-thirds of the mathematics teachers felt there was no change in students' aspirations. In general, any change noted was believed to have occurred in a few students only.

The six guidance counselors agreed with those teachers who believed that students began with negative attitudes to school. Like the teachers, the counselors saw change in a positive direction in "few" students in most schools. Counselors saw improvement in educational aspirations, but again only for a "few" students; two noted improvement in vocational aspirations, but only for a "few" children. Four counselors felt that they could make no judgment about vocational aspirations. During interviews, guidance counselors reported different estimates of the number of students having realistic views of themselves. Half the counselors felt that "few" students had realistic views of themselves; the remaining three were divided between "most","some"and "no" students holding realistic views. The reasons given for the unrealistic views were "low self-evaluation", "lack of awareness of potential of student", and "lack of male models".

All six principals viewed students' attitudes as positive; two as "extremely" so, two "moderately", and two "slightly positive". The six principals were divided in their estimate of pupils' change in attitude toward learning; three felt there was moderate or slight improvement and three felt there was no change.

8. Educational Aides

The evaluation of the educational aide program was based on questionnaires completed by 102 aides during the first week of the program and by 92 aides during the fifth week of the program. A sample of 46 aides, 46 per cent of the initial number of aides who completed both pre- and postquestionnaires, were interviewed by the evaluation staff. In addition, 60 aides discussed the program with an observer during the fourth week of the program; a record of the discussion was kept by one member of the observation team. Finally, principals and teachers were asked in interviews and by questionnaires to evaluate the role of the educational aide and his contributions to the program.

All the educational aides in the Summer Institutes were high school graduates. Forty per cent were male, 60 per cent female, ranging in age from 17 to 20 years, with a mean age of 18. Ninety-eight per cent of the aides hoped to continue their education in the fall. The majority (71 per cent) wished to enter professional careers. Forty-four per cent wanted to be teachers, 29 per cent expected to enter the social services, and the others expected to enter clerical or artistic fields.

The aide program was not initiated until June 1st, so publicity was limited and information about the program was disseminated mainly through schools and Community Progress Centers. Forty-one per cent of the aides found out about the program through the schools, (mainly through a guidance counselor), 34 per cent obtained information about the program from the Community Progress Centers, 21 per cent learned about it from friends, and the other 4 per cent from miscellaneous sources. Application for the position was made at the schools' Community Centers, and specific referrals were made to the coordinator's office at the Board of Education. The fact that 63 per cent of the aides applied for their positions at the Community Progress Centers indicates the broad possibilities for community involvement in school program.

The predominant reason for applying was the "need to earn money" for 45 per cent of the aides. The other 55 per cent expressed either a desire to "help others", "a liking for children", or a desire for experience in a job that was related to their future goals.

As a result of the late start of the program, there were no specific centralized orientation procedures for the aides. Only 3 per cent of the aides reported receiving some formal orientation for their assignment. Nevertheless, 87 per cent felt adequately prepared to assist in the program both when questioned at the beginning of the program and again at the end.

The aides anticipated that their primary responsibility would be to provide "individual help in instruction" (50 per cent) and to "motivate and encourage students in the classroom" (27 per cent). The remaining 23 per cent felt they would "free the teacher" for instruction by "relieving her of routine tasks". Specifically,they would help in improving reading skills or failed subjects, assisting the teacher with language problems and with the introduction of new techniques.

For the first week of the program, only 58 per cent of the aides studied by the evaluation team said they were assigned specific duties. By the fifth week of the program 75 per cent of the aides had advance assignments while 25 per cent were assigned to reading and mathematics classes and a little less than a third to other subject areas.

Every aide had a strongly positive expectation for student gain in achievement and attitude toward school as a result of the summer program. Almost 60 per cent of the aides felt that the program was most helpful to students because of individual attention; 29 per cent indicated that the students had improved academically, and a small number noted that some students perceived learning as more enjoyable. Some of the aides noted that at the very least, the program had kept the students off the streets.

The factors which the educational aides believed produced these positive changes were: their own understanding of pupils because of similiarity in background, personal experience and personal problems (34 per cent); liking and understanding of children (29 per cent); opportunity to work with students on educational or personal problems (24 per cent); and assistance from teachers and other school personnel (11 per cent). [4]

The major factors which the aides believed restricted their effectiveness included overwhelming student problems that required professional attention (30 per cent); assignment of aides to duties outside of classroom (20 per cent); and their lack of special skills in subject areas (13 per cent).

During the discussion with the educational aides it was noted that the majority of aides enjoyed the work and considered it a good opportunity to explore the possibilities of teaching. They gained a great deal of respect and understanding for the teacher and became aware of the difficulties of making a lesson interesting and relating it to the pupil. The main problems of the program listed by the aides were: a. Students' lag in achievement,which caused frustration and disciplinary problems; and b. The instructional period of 90 minutes, which the aides felt was too long (in contrast to the satisfaction of both teachers and supervisory staff with period length).

---

[4] These data came from the discussion guides the aides completed after discussing these questions with the evaluation staff.

Both the principals and the teachers were asked to rate the usefulness of the educational aides. Approximately three-quarters of teachers and supervisors agreed that the aides had been useful to a "moderate" or "great extent". The clerical and patrol duties seemed to be the most important contributions of the educational aides, according to both teachers and principals; the loss of this clerical and patrol assistance would affect teaching and individual instruction in the opinion of the majority of both teachers (80 per cent) and supervisors (75 per cent). However, the other teachers and principals felt nothing would change in the summer program if no aides were assigned.

In summary, the assignment of recent high school graduates as educational aides, was rated positively by teachers, principals, and the aides themselves. The school staff perceived the aides as helpful mainly in the execution of the non-instructional tasks. The aides, who had benefitted from their participation in the program, perceived their primary responsibility as helping children by assisting the teacher in instructional tasks. Likeness in age, background, experience and similiarity of problems were factors that aides felt helped them relate to the students in the class.

9. Attendance

In evaluating attendance in the Summer Institutes, two questions were raised: the extent to which children who preregistered actually appeared, and the extent to which children who began the program actually attended classes. Estimates of attrition are presented in Table 13, for the six Summer Institutes in the sample, and for the 20 institutes for which data supplied by the Board of Education were available.[5] As can be seen, the loss between the preregistration period and the first days of school for the sample institutes ranged from a low of 8 per cent to a high of 24 per cent.

During the summer, there were moderate changes in register. Some institutes discharged more than they admitted, others admitted more, but in no case was the overall change more than 15 per cent of the opening register.

The data on attendance appear in Table 14 for randomly selected classes in each of the sample institutes. In the reading classes studied, attendance ranged from 75 per cent to 93 per cent, with an overall average of 82 per cent. In the mathematics classes the range was from 70 to 91 per cent, with an overall average attendance of 86 per cent. The overall per cent attendance reported by the Board of Education for the junior high schools in the regular academic year was 88 per cent; these summer figures are reasonably close to what normally occurs at the junior high school level.

---

[5] Attrition between preregistration and opening was not a uniform characteristic of all institutes. Of the 20 for which data were available, there was attrition in this period for 15, one school did not change, and four opened with from 7 to 199 more pupils than preregistered.

Table 13

Changes in Pupil Register and Attendance for sample schools and for total program

School	Number Pupils Reg.	Number Present at Opening	Per Cent Present at Opening	Overall Change in Reg. During Summer	Number Admitted	Number Discharged
54	831	672	81 %	27	159	132
201	326	301	92	-38	25	63
136	464	354	76	-27	110	137
61	2184	1778	81	150	406	256
258	492	381	77	43	111	68
8	608	547	90	65	61	126
Total Sample	4905	4033	82 %	220	872	782
Total Program	15008	13895	93 %	-1025	1833	2858

Table 14

Overall Attendance for Sample of

Classes in reading and mathematics

School	No.of Classes Sampled		Reading			Mathematics		
	Reading	Math	Aggregate Possible Days	Aggregate Pupil Attendance	Per Cent Attendance	Aggregate Possible Days	Aggregate Pupil Attendance	Per Cent Attendance
A	6	3	2880	2382	83 %	2207	1553	70 %
B	6	9	5395	4554	84	6783	6041	89
C	6	6	3195	2385	75	3118	2572	82
D	7	6	4720	3614	77	4264	3887	91
E	5	6	2669	2135	80	4212	3491	83
F	7	5	3875	3619	93	2572	2289	89
Total Sample	37	35	22,734	18,689	82 %	23,156	19,833	86 %

Chapter IV

CREATIVE ARTS ACADEMY

The Procedure

The basic evaluation design was followed in the study of the Creative Arts Academy, with changes made in accordance with the enrichment program offered at the Academy.

Classes were selected from the"majors" of music and art. Instrumental, choral and orchestral music classes were observed, as well as classes in fine arts and sculpture. In addition, dance, drama, and creative writing classes were observed.[1] The bases of evaluation were similar to those used for the Summer Institutes, except for the evaluation of achievement. The culminating activities of the arts program were evaluated by the observers. Observation guides were used by the team of eight observers, who were either professionals or educators in the various arts. The music activities, for example, were evaluated by a team of two observers. One was a professional musician, conductor of the New York Symphony, who offered, among his regular performances, a series of concerts in disadvantaged areas of New York City; the second member of this team was a clinical psychologist and educator who has made music his lifetime avocation.

---

[1] The evaluation staff is grateful to Mr. Bernard Mannes, Principal of the Creative Arts Academy, for his gracious and neighborly invitation to visit the Academy at all times and to his staff, who made provision for interviews in a crowded schedule.

The four members of the art observation team were all educators teaching art on the college level. All but one had completed doctoral level studies in the fine arts. The observer of drama and creative writing was scholar-in-residence in drama at one of the outstanding New England Colleges. The dance activities of the Academy were observed by a professional dancer and teacher of the HARYOU-ACT dance group. A total of 16 classes, covering all the activities in music, art, drama, and dance were observed. All 16 teachers of these classes, as well as the visiting artists in residence (when they were available) were interviewed.

The pupil population of the Creative Arts Academy was estimated by the principal as 75 per cent Negro, 15 per cent Puerto Rican, and 10 per cent "other."[2]

Findings

1. Implementation of the Program

The school day was four and a half hours long, and the program lasted 31 days. Teachers were scheduled for three consecutive 90 minute periods of instruction in all enrichment subjects that were offered as "noncredit" courses.

---

[2] For comparison, in the Summer Institutes in the sample, these proportions, also based on principals' estimates, were 65 per cent, 26 per cent, and 9 per cent.

Preplanning of the program took place in the first week of May at the Board of Education. Representatives of the Friends of Music, the principal of the High School of Music and Art, the project coordinator, the Creative Arts Academy principal, and a representative of Industrial Arts High School formulated plans for implementation.

The subjects offered to pupils from disadvantaged areas were vocal or instrumental music, fine arts, dramatics, creative writing, and dance. At the end of the program, students presented activities in music, dance, drama, and art to parents and the public at the High School of Music and Art and at a morning performance in Central Park. A schedule of trips offered students a chance to meet with artists, and attend concerts, museums, and a performance of a Broadway play.

The observers who visited classes found that some class activities were not in accord with the course title; for example, advertising and fashion design were not taught. Advertising was dropped because the instructor felt, "advertising design is too specialized. Our students need more basic training in drawing and painting." The instructor of a fashion design course, licensed in homemaking, did not have materials or sewing machines available, although student interest in fashion design was very high. Costumes for the dramatic production were made by this teacher without any apparent involvement of the students. The sculpture class started late in the program. In the painting classes, no instruction was offered in oils because oil paints were not available.

Administrative and teaching personnel were appointed by the project coordinator at the Board of Education. The supervisory staff all had secondary school licenses. The teacher-in-charge of the program was licensed as a junior high school principal, and had four years' experience. The chairmen were appropriately licensed in music, art, English and the language arts. All 16 teachers were qualified to teach in their subject with one exception -- a teacher of homemaking was assigned to teach fashion design. The teachers had an average of nine years of teaching experience, with no teacher having less than three years of experience. The duties of the three chairmen differed: the chairman of music (initial enrollment of 291 pupils) was responsible for screening students, programming teachers, and developing curriculum; the art chairman (initial enrollment of 156 pupils) was responsible for administration and supervision of the art content of the various art courses; the chairman of the English and creative writing program, which had the smallest pupil enrollment (40 pupils), seemed to the observers to be serving a public relations function in addition to fulfilling administrative responsibilities. Eleven of the 16 teachers saw their primary responsibility as teaching, and felt that their job was enjoyable. All the teachers were able to plan activities based on student interest and capabilities and reported great freedom in planning the course of study.

In interviews, the supervisory and teaching staff indicated that the materials for instruction were "adequate" and that they arrived on time. Students discussing this topic felt there could have been greater variety and abundance of art materials. This was supported by the observers who saw few materials other than those included in the regular art programs.

The administrative staff and chairmen felt that the classroom facilities were "basically satisfactory" or "very good as is." Teachers' opinions reflected the different needs of the subject areas taught; six rated the facilities as "very good," and four as "basically satisfactory but in need of some improvement." Three of the art teachers felt the facilities needed "considerable improvement." The observers noted that the gymnasium did not have showers and was not suitable for a dance class, the auditorium was too large for informal drama productions, and a kiln was necessary if ceramics was to be an ongoing activity. Nevertheless, teachers and observers alike characterized the general school atmosphere as a "warm professional atmosphere."

2. Evaluation of Quality of Instruction

Classes were observed during the last weeks of the program when they were involved in preparation for the culminating activities. Observation guides were used and included an evaluation of the "amount of planning," provision for "individual work," "level of creativity and imagination," "the extent of student and teacher communication" and children's "interest and ethusiasm." Finally, the overall quality of the lesson was rated by the observers.

Two observers visited six classes with different musical activities. They rated the teachers' own musical knowledge as "good" to "very good." Actual instruction was rated as "good" to remarkably good" and "extremely effective." In a few instances a lack of planning was noted. Creativity and imagination ranged from "high" to "low" in the classes observed. In only one class of beginning instruction was there some foundation for independent work. The teacher-child relationship was very positive, teachers encouraged questions and used "an informal, humorous" approach to communicate with students. On the whole, the music program offered instruction by qualified teachers, possessing a good knowledge of music, in an informal learning atmosphere.

The evaluation of the quality of art instruction is limited by the fact that the four observers never saw direct instruction in any of the classes observed. They did report seeing what they called a "studio atmosphere," an atmosphere which was conducive to learning, in which students were at work individually and were encouraged to experiment with various media. Students were permitted to change their choice of art subjects after three weeks of the program if they wished to do so. This flexible use of course offerings helped to maintain student participation in the program and made students available for the culminating activities in art and drama.

Pupil enrollment in drama and creative writing classes was small. The original program of informal improvisation and readings was interrupted by the decision to present a culminating dramatic event at the end of the program. The observer viewed this "product-oriented" part of the program during the fifth week of the summer session. The direction of the dramatic program was rated as "lacking in artistic values," and therefore poor. The emphasis was largely on mechanics, resulting in "low" levels of creativity and imagination. The pressure to show results was judged to be "deadening and destructive."

The outstanding strength of the dance teacher, as rated by the observer, was her fine ability as a choreographer. The extent of creativity and imagination was high, and the teacher showed great ability to teach a large group with a very wide range of age and ability. The children and the teacher had excellent rapport. However, instruction was considered inadequate in specific dance techniques.

All observers in all areas reported excellent teacher-student relationships. They noted the extent of self-discipline and inner direction of the pupils. Children's interest and enthusiasm were rated "very high" in music, art and dance classes.

All but one observer and two chairmen agreed that there was high interest of children, despite little evidence of artistic talent, in art, drama, and creative writing. Only the music program enrolled children on the basis of known and demonstrated talent and experience. The eligibility requirement that children be "reading on or above grade level and have a record of good behavior" may have eliminated many students with artistic talent who could not meet these requirements.

3. School Staff Appraisal of the Program

The staff reaction to the program was obtained through personal interviews. The principal, three chairmen, and 16 teachers were asked to rate ten aspects of the summer program on a five-point scale. In addition, they were given the opportunity to evaluate the major contributions of the summer program, describe its strengths and weaknesses, and offer recommendations for change.

The ratings of the summer program were made on a scale ranging from the positive judgments, "basically satisfactory," or "very good as is," to the negative judgments, "needs some change," or "needs to be entirely revised." Provision was also made for a rating of "no judgment," or "does not apply."

Overall, teachers were consistently positive in their evaluations of the ten aspects studied. Only once, in rating "communication between school staff and specialists," did a majority (75 per cent) see a need for improvement.

In the general area of school organization, "class size" was rated positively by 71 per cent of the teachers responding; "organization of program within school" was rated positively by 64 per cent of respondents, and the 90-minute periods were rated positively by 64 per cent of the respondents. Four teachers indicated a need for change or revision.

The four aspects of the instructional program to be rated were all judged positively. The "program itself" (9 of the 11 responding), "materials of instruction" (8 of the 10 responding), "class trips" (10 of 13), and "classroom facilities" (10 of 13) were considered "basically satisfactory" or "very good as is." A positive rating by 11 of 13 teachers was recorded on the "availability of special consultants and artists in residence." It was in this area, however, that the only negative rating was recorded. Nine of the 12 teachers rating the "communication between school, staff and specialists" indicated that change or revision in this area was needed.

The principal rated every aspect of the program listed above as "very good as is." Chairmen indicated the differing needs of their programs in their ratings; the chairman of drama (and four teachers) rated "class size" as too small for an effective program. The chairman of music and drama (and three music teachers) felt that the three consecutive 90-minute class periods were too exhausting for the teachers and students.

Supervisor and chairmen ratings of the selection of students were divided equally: two expressed a need for change, and two felt that selection was basically satisfactory or very good as it was.

All of the 16 teachers and the four supervisors interviewed felt that the students had benefitted from the summer program. As one said, "Increased insight and understanding for the arts and an appreciation of a creative atmosphere" contributed to student growth and maturity.

The majority of the teachers in art and music rated the Academy as "basically satisfactory, but in need of some improvement." Only one teacher in art thought that the program "needed to be revised." The teachers of drama and creative writing were divided equally: two teachers felt that it was "basically satisfactory," and two felt that it "needed to be entirely changed."

All supervisory staff and chairmen in all departments indicated a desire to participate in the Creative Arts Academy program next summer if it were continued. Personal interest, ideas for changing and strengthening the program, a belief that the "bugs will be ironed out," and a "desire to increase the contributions of both students and teachers" were some of the reasons given for the interest in future participation.

4. Children's Attitudes, Educational and Vocational Aspirations

The pupil sample for the study of attitudes and aspirations included 74 girls and 64 boys. They ranged in age from 13 to 16, with a mean age of 13.6 for both sexes. Because one student traveled from Staten Island to take part in the program they represented all five boroughs; half came from Manhattan, one-fourth from the Bronx, and a little less than 25 per cent from Brooklyn and Queens. Three-quarters of the students in this sample had never attended summer school before. Of the quarter that had, one-half had previously studied music during the summer.

Eighty per cent of the students heard about the program from their teachers, 10 per cent from guidance counselors, and 10 per cent from friends and siblings.

Most of the students indicated in the pupil questionnaire that their reasons for enrolling in the Academy were an "interest or liking for music" and a "desire for self-improvement." Ten per cent were preparing for admission to the High School of Music and Art. Nineteen per cent said, "It will keep me off the streets."

All the students had very positive attitudes toward summer programs and were "glad to be at the Academy." This was confirmed by staff comments. Pupils were confident that participation in the program would help them "do better in school" (67 per cent). A small number (10 per cent) expressed a personal need or reaction ("will help me feel better," or "have nothing else to do") and 24 per cent simply said, "I like it."

These positive pupil responses were confirmed by the findings of the pupil questionnaires given at the end of the program. One-third of the pupils said, "It helped me develop my talent," and 21 per cent said of the Academy, "It's fun."

In group discussions, interviews, and questionnaires, 70 per cent of the students indicated that they had more "freedom and independence" in the summer program. Twenty-four per cent felt that summer school was "more fun" and that they learned "more new things."

The overwhelming majority of the students were college-oriented: 95 per cent of the 138 pupils planned to stay in school until college, and 99 per cent of those expressed a desire to complete college. Most of them indicated no change in educational plans or desires for the future; they had come to the Academy oriented to college and they still were.

Eighty per cent of students who completed the prequestionnaire hoped to enter professional fields (medicine, law, teaching, science). Of the remaining students, 10 per cent wanted to be musicians, and 10 per cent planned to be teachers of music. Of the students for whom pre- and postquestionnaires were available for comparison, little change in vocational aspirations was indicated. Eighty-seven per cent reported no change in career plans,and the few who did report a change did not state what it was.

The educational and vocational aspirations of the student body were typical of career choices of children described as "middle class," although the supervisory staff described the children as "disadvantaged." The impressions of the observers, suggest that in terms of interest and experiential background, as in occupational choice, the "disadvantaged" description was misleading.

Discussions and interviews with groups of students pointed to many characteristic interests and attitudes typical of children. The extent of family interest and participation in the arts and outside activities of the students confirm this: 84 per cent of pupil respondents reported a long-standing interest in music and art. Of these, 32 per cent had taken lessons outside of school. Eighty per cent of the students indicated that they had at least one relative who played an instrument or had artistic ability, and 30 per cent had two or more relatives with experience in the arts.

Almost all the students (94 per cent) recommended that the Academy program be continued next year. Pupil suggestions for changes in the program were concerned mainly with school organization. Thirteen per cent of the pupils recommended a later start in the school day because of the long distance between home and school, and 10 per cent suggested that the programs be extended through the month of August.

5. Staff Appraisal of Children's Attitudes and Aspirations

Interviews conducted with the staff indicated unanimous appraisal of positive pupil attitudes toward school and learning. The high interest of the students was reported, although it was noted that "high interest was not commensurate with talent." The principal and both chairmen thought that children had gained substantially from the program. In drama and creative writing, the staff felt that the demands of the culminating performances interfered with a program that attempted to develop needed skills of children who were poor in oral and written communication. The staff interviews did not generally indicate an awareness of the high career aspirations of the pupils.

6. Educational Aides

Twenty-three aides completed questionnaires during the first and fifth week of the program. Interviews were held with supervisory staff and teachers who were also asked to evaluate the role of the educational aides and their contributions to the program.

Thirteen male and ten female aides were assigned to the Creative Arts Academy at the beginning of the summer program. Their ages ranged from 17 to 21 years, with a mean age of 18.

Seventy-eight per cent of the aides were recent graduates of the High School of Music and Art, High School of Performing Arts, and the High School of Fashion Design. The other three aides were already in college. These three were assigned to the community artist-in-residence in charge of the literary magazine and were very active in all phases of its production.

With one exception, all of the aides intended to attend college in the fall. Two-thirds wished to enter professional careers; and three of these wanted to become teachers. One-fourth of the aides were interested in a career in the arts.

Nineteen of the aides heard about the Academy program through their high schools; only three heard of it through their Community Progress Center. For the majority of aides, the "desire to work and the need to earn money" was one of the predominant reasons for seeking the position. The other reason stated by most aides was a "liking for children."

No orientation sessions were held as preparation for the program. These aides were divided in their feelings of adequacy to assist in the classroom; 13 felt adequately prepared to assist, while eight felt inadequately prepared at the beginning of the program.

The majority of aides participated actively in the classroom; 78 per cent assisted the teacher either through preparation of materials and/or through instruction of individual students. All the aides felt that they had benefitted from their participation in the Creative Arts Academy. Almost all indicated that they would like to continue working with children.

The staff rating of the extent of usefulness of the educational aides was generally more positive in the art and music programs as compared with the drama program. The majority (80 per cent) of the art and music staff rated the aides' contribution as useful "to a great extent." In drama, the rating varied from "to a slight extent" to "a moderate extent."

The art and drama teachers reported that the aides' tasks included assisting them in whole class instruction, helping individual students, preparing materials, and clerical matters. Teachers of music tended to assign aides to preparation of materials and clerical work. In addition, several teachers felt that their own time for instruction would be shortened and that their students would have less freedom without the help of aides.

The supervisory staff felt that the greatest contribution of the aides was tutoring individual students and assisting in preparation of materials.

In general, the aides felt that they contributed to the program by offering students their experience and talent in the arts. Most of the aides felt that the summer program in the arts was a good one. Nineteen aides expressed a "slightly positive" to "positive" rating for activities in music, art, and drama. Four aides rated the summer program in these subjects as "slightly negative" or "negative."

7. Staff Appraisal of the Strengths and Weakness of the Academy Program

The supervisory and administration staff were in accord in describing the exposure of children, for the first time, to a school atmosphere where learning was valuable, pleasurable, comfortable, and fun,as the most valuable part of the summer program.

The chairmen responsible for instruction saw the strength of the program as an "opportunity for students to work intensively in creative activities," and to "gain independence in free training in the arts and the experience of artists."

The teaching staff expressed an "opportunity for a variety of creative expression" in a "professional studio atmosphere offering a free and flexible program," as the predominent strength.

The supervisory staff saw no real weaknesses in the program. In music, the 90-minute period (considered a strength in the art program) and the early start of the school day, caused difficulties for staff who were assigned to three consecutive 90-minute periods. The need for a cafeteria and snack time was another "weakness" cited.

In drama, the teachers and supervisor noted that poor publicity and recruitment resulted in too few students for a successful program. Another weakness was the "product-oriented" goal of the program.

Teachers saw the major weakness of the program as a lack of clearly defined goals, and poor communication and coordination among the various "departments" of the program. The short duration of the program and lack of publicity were other shortcomings cited by more than one teacher.

The valuable contribution of the program was predominantly the free learning atmosphere. The weaknesses occurred in the implementation of the program, and could be remedied in future programs by more clearly defined goals, more effective recruitment, better coordination, and the establishment of channels of communication between departmental staff members.

8. Culminating Activities

All the arts were represented at the final program offered to parents and the public at the High School of Music and Art during the last week of the program.[3] The decision to include both choral and instrumental music, dance groups, and drama and poetry readings made the program long, in the judgment of the observers.

---

[3] A literary journal prepared by students was not ready at the end of the program and therefore could not be evaluated in this study.

The musical program was a concert performance of the senior band, orchestra, and chorus. These children were described by the observers as "enthusiastic and playing well," and the dancers were described as showing to advantage their abilities in African, jazz, and modern dance.

The program of poetry readings and the dramatic performance (an adaptation of "The Happy Prince" by Oscar Wilde) were rated as inappropriate and poor choices and were judged as being poorly directed.

A morning performance by the orchestra and chorus in the mall at Central Park was rated as "adequate" in spite of a poor sound system. The choice of a morning performance accounted for the small audience, in the opinion of the observer.

An art exhibit was on display in the halls and lobby of the high school.

Recommendations

The identification of talent in school children should be encouraged, and the Academy's pupil eligibility requirements should be broadened to include these children in the program. The discovery and positive support of talented children would have far-reaching effects on students, staff, and the community. Another consideration is that the inclusion of talented pupils might result in a school that could be a meeting ground where talent is the equalizer and where color plays no role.

The inhibiting effect of the final formal performance should be considered in future programs. With a "show" to put on, only a few selections are studied and polished. Spontaneity in improvisations and informal readings are ruled out. Yet the needs of the students are for ongoing practice and repeated opportunities to perform. This could be done if programs by individuals and groups, were set for showing each week rather than having five days of continual instruction. If a final performance is desired, it could include the highlights of the weekly programs.

Despite these two reservations, it is clear that, considered as a total entity, the Creative Arts Academy was a successful innovation and useful addition for the summer program at the junior high school level. Staff and children alike were in accord that the experience was worthwhile and enjoyable, and,in general,the observers agreed. Enthusiasm, interest, and involvement characterized the children and the staff as well. We feel that the Academy indicates the potential for creative development of programs in the arts, and that it has gotten these programs off to a good start.

CHAPTER V

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

To the child who had not learned the basic skills of reading and arithmetic a summer remedial program was offered without credit in regular schools and schools funded under Title I. To the child who had mastered the basic reading skills, a program of enrichment in music, art, dance, drama, and creative writing was offered without credit in a Creative Arts Academy program. Both the Summer Institutes and the Creative Arts Academy were assigned educational aides (recent high school graduates residing in poverty-impacted areas), to assist teachers in the classroom. In addition, guidance counselors were assigned to the Summer Institutes to provide educational and vocational counseling for the pupils.

The overall evaluation of the Summer Institute program was consistently positive.[1] Perhaps the most striking feature was that the gains in achievement were obtained in both reading and mathematics, and these gains were of statistical and educational significance, averaging .5 of a year in mathematics and .4 of a year in reading.[2]

---

[1] The generally positive overall evaluation of the Creative Arts Academy is noted at the conclusion of Chapter IV.

[2] This success of the reading program leads the evaluation staff to wonder if one can generalize about the extension of the Corrective Reading Program of the regular school program to a daily,double period of instruction for students severely retarded in reading.

The aspects of the teaching-learning process that were evaluated were rated as average or better than average in quality; staff morale was good; and children's attitudes and responses were generally positive. Staff and observers agreed that children benefitted from the program.

There were, of course, areas needing improvement. Children who began the summer reading near, at, or above grade level regressed rather than improved. A third of the children would not want to repeat their summer experience. Many hundreds who preregistered never appeared to begin the program. But these problems and weaknesses should not obscure the basic overall positive picture.

A synthesis of suggestions for improvement, voiced by supervisors, teachers, special staff aides, children, and the evaluation team follows: Implementation of the program could be improved by earlier planning for instructional staff, assignment of courses, and ordering of materials. Where services were not fully utilized, as in the Creative Arts Academy, earlier and more effective publicity for recruitment of children were concerns.[3]

Orientation sessions for staff and clear definition of roles and functions (particularly for educational aides and guidance counselors), were basic recommendations of coordinators, supervisors, and special staff. Orientation sessions preferably would be held at each individual Summer Institute.

Changes in preregistration procedures of students at their home school were recommended by supervisors. Direct registration at the

---

[3] Other recommendations for improvement of the program of the Creative Arts Academy are given at the end of Chapter IV.

Summer Institute by students bringing a letter from their home school was suggested as one alternative procedure.

The 90-minute period, and 5-day week, are mandatory for credit in major subjects, but do not apply to noncredit subjects. Flexibility in programming lengths of period and number of weeks might result in more effective implementation of the program. The 90-minute period of instruction, satisfactory in reading and art, was a decided handicap to the teachers of mathematics and music. Class trips, useful in the development of a wider range of experience for students, did not exist in the majority of the Summer Institutes; allowing one day a week for either trips or visiting guests could remedy this. Provision for time for a break between classes was recommended by both staff and students. The early start of the school day caused hardships for students who had to travel any distance to school. The need for communication between staff and administration in the schools could be remedied by a longer school day. The addition of a course in corrective mathematics was suggested by the mathematics coordinator at the Board of Education. The reading coordinator recommended that an enrichment program be developed for the more able students who did not benefit from the instructional program of the Summer Institutes.

In the opinion of the evaluation staff, no remedial program can be fully effective without the use of diagnostic measures to ascertain the learning steps that must be mastered in acquiring the skills in mathematics and reading. Diagnostic tests and informal textbooks administered with the help of educational aides would provide useful insight into students' ability and progress.

The need for more and better reading and mathematics materials was suggested by most members of the teaching staff as well as by the reading coordinator, who suggested a specific series of texts and multilithed materials for future purchase. In the opinion of the evaluation staff, distribution of paperback books to students, including a dictionary, would provide the beginning of personal book collection. Libraries should be stocked with collections of paperback books of interest to the junior high school student. The free borrowing of these books for outside reading would be in accord with the librarian's recommendation that children be permitted to take books out of the library, a practice that did not exist in the institutes. Fear of loss of books was the sole reason given for this restrictive policy. The low cost of paperback books should help minimize the effects of loss.

Both the Summer Institutes and the Academy staffs requested an increase in the number of aides assigned to them. With few exceptions, everyone agreed that the aides were a successful addition to the summer program.

The policy of teaching library skills alone was a decided deterrent to the remedial reading program. Librarians recommended that time in the school day be devoted to active use of the library.

Better role definition was the basic recommendation of the guidance staff. Poor articulation with the home school made the guidance program appear ineffective. The assignment of a guidance coordinator at the Board of Education was recommended by the counselors. The evaluation project staff also suggested the active exploration of group counseling. Discussions of this nature would involve the student and counselor in a dynamic situation with good possibilities for growth and self-understanding.

Recommendation for a reading consultant for each Summer Institute was made by the project director at the Board of Education by the reading coordinator, and by the principals.

The evaluation staff also recommended the creation of the positions of reading and mathematics chairmen in the Summer Institutes, similar to the chairmen of the arts in the Creative Arts Academy. The need for personnel solely responsible for the educational program of the Summer Institute is not completely met by the principal where role is primarily admininistrative and supervisory.

In fact, the complexity and importance of the summer program is such that we think it might be appropriate to consider appointing a permanent staff for summer activities in both elementary and secondary schools on a year-round basis. Such a staff, assigned to the Board of Education, would give continuity to the increased year-round use of the schools. Moreover, it would expedite the development,planning and implementation of program to meet the needs of the children in our city.

APPENDIX B

B1

THE CITY COLLEGE
Office of Research and Evaluation Services

Summer School Program for Junior High
and Intermediate School Pupils-Summer 1967

July 27, 1967

Dear Sir,

As part of the evaluation of the Summer Junior High School and Intermediate Schools Program, we should like to advise you of the following procedures and observation dates in your school:

1. Classroom observations and interviews of principal, special personnel, and individual students will take place on ____________________ and ____________________.
2. Post-Testing of students in reading and mathematics will take place on ______________________________.
3. Post-Testing of students and Educational Aides will take on ______________________________.
4. We shall need a room for our interviewers on the days of our observations (Item 1).
5. Class rosters are enclosed for the post-testing in reading. Please have these forms filled out in triplicate with the names of the students in their classes. Early collection and return of these forms is necessary if we are to send them to you in time for your final records.

If there are any questions, I can be reached at 368-1100.

Once again, I wish to express my sincere thanks for your help and cooperation.

Very truly yours,

Emmeline Weinberg
Project Director

B2

Code_______________ (Leave Blank)

THE CITY COLLEGE
Office of Research and Evaluation Services

Summer School Program for Junior High
and Intermediate School Pupils-Summer 1967

Pupil Questionnaire

Name________________________________ Male____ Female_______ Summer School______

Age________ Summer School Class________ Junior High School__________________

Borough________________________________ Grade____________

1. How did you find out about summer school? (circle one of these)

1. Teacher	4. Parent
2. Guidance Counselor	5. Friend
3. Principal	6. Other ____________________

2. I am going to summer school because (complete the sentence)

3. Are you glad you are in the summer school program? (circle your answer)

1. Yes
   Why?

2. No

3. Other

4. What subjects are you taking this summer? (circle the subjects you are taking),

1. Art
2. English Language Arts
3. English as a second language
4. Reading
5. Foreign language
6. Home Economics
7. Industrial Arts
8. Mathematics
9. Music
10. Science
11. Social Studies
12. Typing

5. Do you think summer school will help you? (circle your answer)

1. Yes
2. No
3. Don't know

If yes, circle one or more than one reason.

1. Will help me do better in school.
2. Will help me get a job.
3. Will help me pass my subjects.
4. Will help me feel better.
5. Other

If no, I do not think it will help me because (complete this sentence)

6. What job would you like to have when you finish school?

7. How long do you plan to stay in school? (circle your answer)

1. Finish junior high school
2. Finish high school
3. Finish college
4. Until I am 16
5. Other

8. How long would you like to stay in school? (circle your answer)

    1. Finish junior high school
    2. Finish high school
    3. Finish college
    4. Until I am 16
    5. Other

9. What job do you think you will have when you leave school?

10. Do you participate in P.A.L. activities during the summer? (circle your answer)

    1. Yes
    2. No

11. Do you have a summer job? (circle your answer)

    1. Yes
    2. No

    If yes, what do you do?

    When?
    1. Afternoons
    2. After school
    3. Weekends

12. Have you ever attended summer session before?

    When - Year__________

    Where- School__________________ Borough_______________

    What subject did you take?

Code________________
(Leave Blank)

THE CITY COLLEGE
Office of Research and Evaluation Services

Summer School Program for Junior High
and Intermediate School Pupils-Summer 1967

Librarian Questionnaire

Summer School J.H.S.________ Borough________ Date______ Interviewer___________

Name_________________________________ Male_______ Female________

School Assignment: J.H.S.____________________ Borough_______________

1. How long have you been a librarian in summer school?___________
(Years)

2. How long have you been a librarian in regular school program?_______
(Years)

3. In what areas do you hold a license (check one or more)

Regular___ Sub___ Common Branches___ J.H.S.___ High School___

Subject areas____________________ Library Science_________

Years of experience______

Teacher______ (subject_________________)

Librarian_________ Other (specify)______________________

4. Describe briefly your job responsibilities for the Summer Institute Program.

5. Are librarian's services available to every student? (circle one)

1. Yes 2. No

If no, specify to whom it is available.

6. How many of the student's take advantage of the services offered by you? (Check appropriate responses)

1. All of them
2. Most of them
3. Some of them
4. Few of them
5. None

Code__________
(Leave blank)

THE CITY COLLEGE
Office of Research and Evaluation Services

Summer School Program for Junior High
and Intermediate School Pupils-Summer, 1967

Teacher Questionnaire

Name__________ Date__________

Summer School__________ Borough__________

Regular School__________ Borough__________

Subjects Taught__________ __________ __________

Class Assignments: (please designate by school code)	__________	Registers:	__________
	__________		__________
	__________		__________

1. Please circle or fill in the appropriate response indicating your educational and professional background.

   A. Licenses: Early Childhood　Common Branches
   Junior High School　High School
   Subjects__________

   B. Teaching Experience: (please indicate number of years)
   High School______　Intermediate School______
   Junior High______　Elementary School______

   C. Teaching Preparation: Regular Teacher Education Program
   Intensive Teacher Training Program
   Other (specify)__________

   D. Courses taken relating to teaching of Reading or Math:

	graduate	undergraduate	in-service
1) Methods of Reading	______	______	______
2) Diagnosis of Reading Disabilities	______	______	______
3) Modern Methods of Teaching Math. circle: elementary	______	______	______
J.H.S.	______	______	______
H.S.	______	______	______
4) Other__________	______	______	______

Teacher Questionnaire

2. What is your opinion of the Summer Institute Program?
   a. Needs to be entirely changed or revised
   b. Needs considerable improvement
   c. Basically satisfactory but in need of some improvement
   d. Very good as is

3. Would you describe briefly your job responsibilities in this program as you see them.

4. Please rate the following aspects of the Summer Institute Program listed below according to the following scale:

0 = no judgment
1 = Should be entirely changed or revised
2 = Needs considerable revision
3 = Basically satisfactory but in need of some improvement
4 = Very good as is
X = Does not apply

a. Class size ____
b. 90 minute periods ____
c. Homogeneous grouping in reading ____
d. Heterogeneous grouping in math ____
e. Use of Educational Aides ____
f. Organization of program within school ____
g. Availability of special consultants (reading, guidance, librarian) ____
h. Instructional program ____
i. Classroom facilities ____
j. Materials or instruction ____
k. Class trips ____
l. Communication between school staff, specialists, etc. ____
m. Other________________ ____

Please use the space below for comments and suggestions you may have about the aspects of the program you have rated (1-3) as needing change or improvement. (You may designate each aspect by the letter preceding it in the list above.)

5. To what extent have the Educational Aides been useful? (Check one for the appropriate subject.)

	Reading	Math
a. To a great extent	______	___
b. To a moderate extent	______	___
c. To a slight extent	______	___
d. No judgment	______	___
e. Other________________	______	___

6. In what way were the Educational Aides utilized? (Check one for the appropriate subject.)

	Reading	Math
a. Assisting teacher in whole class instruction	______	___
b. Tutoring individual students	______	___
c. Assisting with preparation of materials	______	___
d. Assisting with patrol duty	______	___
e. Other_____________________	______	___

7. What aspects of the Summer Institute Program would change if no Educational Aides were available?

8. Did you have sufficient time to have discussions with your students?
   a. Yes (circle one)
   b. No

If yes, when? (Circle one or more.)
   a. Individual conference
   b. Small group discussion
   c. During class lesson
   d. Other_____________________

9. A. As you see them, what are the students' own feelings toward the following aspects of their attitudinal structure?

	Very positive	Slightly positive	Slightly negative	Very negative	No opinion	No judgment
a. Attitude toward school	___	___	___	___	___	___
b. Expectation of success in school	___	___	___	___	___	___
c. Educational aspiration level	___	___	___	___	___	___
d. Vocational aspiration level	___	___	___	___	___	___

B. Do you think these students' views are: (circle one)

a. Realistic
b. Unrealistic

10. In your opinion, to what extent has there been a noticeable change in students' attitudes toward any of these?

	Very positive	Slightly positive	No change	Slightly negative	negative
a. Attitude toward school	___	___	___	___	___
b. Expectation of success in school	___	___	___	___	___
c. Educational aspiration level	___	___	___	___	___
d. Vocational aspiration level	___	___	___	___	___

11. If there was change, in what proportion of students was it seen?

	Most	Many	Few	None	No judgment
a. Attitude toward school	___	___	___	___	___
b. Expectation of success in school	___	___	___	___	___
c. Educational aspiration level	___	___	___	___	___
d. Vocational aspiration level	___	___	___	___	___

Teacher Questionnaire

12. Has the Summer Institute Program benefited the students you have taught? (Circle one.)
    a. Yes
    b. No

    If yes, how has it helped?

13. What do you consider the major strengths of the Summer Institute Program?

14. What do you consider the major weaknesses of the Summer Institute Program?

15. What recommendations would you make to improve the program?

16. Additional comments:

Code__________
(Leave Blank)

THE CITY COLLEGE
Office of Research and Evaluation Services

Summer School Program for Junior High
and Intermediate School Pupils-Summer 1967

Pupil Interview--Instructions to Interviewers

1. Format of Interview
   a) Ten students--five from reading class
   five from math class
   (Each interviewer to choose students from class he has just observed.)

   b) Two interviewers--meeting with group of ten in a private room designated by the principal of the school;

   one interviewer conducts discussion and administers the questionnaire;

   one interviewer sits in back recording responses from discussion.

2. Directions to Interviewer
   a) Introduce yourself--tell students your name, where you are from, why you are there, e.g. "We would like to learn what we can about the summer program. Since you are students in the program, you can help us learn a lot and help us plan next year's program."

   b) Conduct a warm-up discussion using the enclosed questions as guidelines.

   c) Administer written questionnaire to be filled out by pupils.

   d) Write up your assessment of the interview in terms of the students' general feelings, attitudes, etc.

B12

Code________________
(Leave Blank)

THE CITY COLLEGE
Office of Research and Evaluation Services

Summer School Program for Junior High
and Intermediate School Pupils-Summer 1967

Pupil Interview -- Written Portion

Name________________________ Summer School________ Borough________

Class you just came from____________________ Teacher________________

DIRECTIONS: Please answer the following questions about Summer School.

1. What did you do in class most of the time? (Tell only about the class you just came from.)

2. Who helped you the most in this class? (Circle one of the following)

   a. Teacher
   b. Educational Aide
   c. Guidance Counselor
   d. Principal
   e. None of these people
   f. Someone else (Write in who it was.) ____________________

3. How did this person help you? (Write in a sentence)

4. Who helped you the most in summer school? (Circle one)

   a. Teacher
   b. Educational Aide
   c. Guidance Counselor
   d. Principal
   e. None of these people
   f. Someone else (Write in who it was) ____________________

5. How did this person help you? (Write in a sentence)

6. Do you have anything else to say about the Summer School?

Code________________
(Leave Blank)

THE CITY COLLEGE
Office of Research and Evaluation Services

Summer School Program for Junior High
and Intermediate School Pupils--Summer 1967

Pupil Interview--Discussion portion

The following are guidelines for a free discussion with pupils you have picked from reading and math classes. We are attempting to discover their attitudes toward the Summer Institute Program.

1. How do you feel about going to school in the summer? (What do you like, what don't you like, etc)

2. If you were the teacher, what would you have the students do in class?

3. Is summer school different from the regular school? How is it different?

4. Which did you like better: Summer School or Regular School? (or neither) Why?

THE CITY COLLEGE
Office of Research and Evaluation Services

Summer School Program for Junior High
and Intermediate School Pupils-Summer 1967

Educational Aides Group Interview

Instructions to Interviewer

1. Format of Interview:

   a) All educational are to assemble in a room designated by the school.

   b) Two interviewers are to be present-one interviewer will administer questionnaire and direct discussion. One interviewer will record general impressions, attitudes, etc. as discussion takes place.

2. Directions to Interviewer

   a) Administer Educational Aide Post Questionnaire to the aides as a group. (15-20 minutes)

   b) Head a free discussion according to the enclosed guidlines. (20-25 minutes)

   c) Record your impressions and evaluation of the Educational Aides reactions, attitudes and suggestions for the summer Institute Program.

THE CITY COLLEGE
Office of Research and Evaluation Services

Summer School Program for Junior High
and Intermediate School Pupils-Summer 1967

Educational Aides Group Interview

Guidelines for Discussion

1. How do you feel about working in a school during the summer?

2. Has your view toward the school situation changed now thatyou are no longer a student but on the insturctional side of the classroom?

3. How many of you had an opportunity to work with these students?

4. What are your feelings about working with students? (Would you like to continue working with them?

5. What do you feel are the main problemsof the students you worked with?

6. To what extent did the teacher discuss these problems direct you in handling them?

7. What did the teacher do to help the studentswith other learning problems?

8. Do you feel the students are more responsive and can learn with persons like yourselves who are closer to them in age? (Explain)

9. If you were in a position to present programs, subjects, etc. that would increase the students success in school and occupational aims what would you suggest?

10. What value do you think there would be in having Educational Aides like yourselves during the school year?

Code________________
(Leave blank)

THE CITY COLLEGE
Office of Research and Evaluation Services

Summer School Program for Junior High
and Intermediate School Pupils-Summer 1967

Educational Aides Questionnaire

Name________________________________ Male______Female______

Address_____________________________ Summer School____________________

Age_________ Summer Class______________

Former High School____________________ Teacher__________________________

Date of Graduation____________________ Borough___________________

(Circle appropriate answer)

1. How did you find out about the summer school educational aide program?

   1. High School
   2. Guidance Counselor
   3. Friend
   4. Parent
   5. Community Progress Center
   6. Other

2. Where did you apply for the job?

   1. Community Progress Center
   2. High School
   3. Church
   4. Other

3. Was there a training session for your job as educational aide?

   Yes No Don't know

4. Did you participate in this special training program for your job as educational aide?

   1. Yes
   2. No

   If yes, who sponsored the program?

   If no, why didn't you participate?

5. How prepared do you feel to assist in the classroom?

   1. More than adequately prepared
   2. Adequately prepared
   3. Less than adequately prepared
   4. Not prepared at all

   If you circled 3 or 4, please explain why.

6. Do you have any specific assigned duties to perform each day?

   1. Yes
   2. No

   List them:

7. What are your present responsibilities as you see them?

   1. Teach entire class
   2. Teach individual students
   3. Assist teacher
   4. Prepare materials
   5. Other

8. How many classes are you assigned to each day?

9. Do you assist in Math_____ Reading______ or other________________?
   (check one or fill in other)

10. In what way do you feel you can contribute to the program?

11. Specifically, how do you feel you can help the students in the classroom?

12. In what ways do you think the program will help the students this summer?

13. Do you think that you will benefit from this program?

    1. Yes
    2. No

    If yes, in what way?

    If no, why?

14. What would you like to be?

15. What do you think you will be?

16. Do you intend to continue your education in the fall?

    1. Yes
    2. No

    If yes, where do you plan to go to school?

    If no, what do you plan to do?

Code________________

THE CITY COLLEGE

Office of Research and Evaluation Services

Summer School Program for Junior High
and Intermediate School Pupils-Summer 1967

Educational Aides Post Questionnaire

Name____ Male___ Female___

Address____________________________ Summer School________________

Age__________ Summer Class________

Former High School____________________ Teacher____________________

Date of Graduation____________________ Borough__________

1. Why did you choose to work as an Educational Aide? (Circle more than one if necessary.)
    - a. Desire to help others
    - b. Liking for children
    - c. Work related to your future occupational goals
    - d. To earn money
    - e. Work for the summer

2. How many classes were you assigned to each day?________
   Were they always the same classes?________________

3. Did you assist in Math____ Reading____ or other______________?
   (Check one or fill in other.)

4. What were your responsibilities as you saw them?
    - a. Teach entire class
    - b. Teach individual students
    - c. Assist teacher
    - d. Prepare materials
    - e. Other

5. Did you have any specific assigned duties to perform each day?
    - a. Yes
    - b. No

   List them:

Educational-Aides Post Questionnaire

6. Now that you have worked as an Educational Aide, do you feel you were prepared to assist in the classroom?
    a. More than adequately prepared
    b. Adequately prepared
    c. Less than adequately prepared
    d. Not prepared at all

    If you circled 3 or 4, please explain why.

7. Did you participate in the special training program for your job as Educational Aide?
    a. Yes
    b. No

    If yes, who sponsored the program?

    If no, why didn't you participate?

8. How do you feel that this special training program helped prepare you to assist in the classroom?
    a. More than adequately prepared
    b. Adequately prepared
    c. Less than adequately prepared
    d. Not prepared at all

9. In what way do you feel you have contributed to the summer school program?

10. Specifically, how do you feel you have helped the students in the classroom?

Educational Aides Post Questionnaire

-3-

11. What factors, in your opinion, contributed to your ability to help these students? (Circle more than one when necessary.)
    - a. Liking and understanding for children
    - b. Understanding of student's educational problems because of similar problems when you were a student
    - c. Understanding of students because of similar background and experience
    - d. Opportunity to work individually with students with their educational or personal problems
    - e. Assistance from teachers and/or school personnel
    - f. Other______________________________________

12. What factors were restrictions to your ability to help these students? (Circle more than one if necessary.)
    - a. Lack of special skills in subject area taught
    - b. Overwhelming problems on part of student that required professional attention (psychologist, social worker, etc.)
    - c. Little assistance from teacher and/or other school personnel
    - d. Assignments to duties that did not bring you in contact with students
    - e. Other______________________________________

13. In what ways do you think the program helped the students this summer?

14. Do you think that you benefited from participating in this program?
    - a. Yes
    - b. No

    If yes, in what way?

    If no, why?

15. Would you like to continue working with children?
    - a. Yes
    - b. No

Educational Aides Post Questionnaire

16. If not, what would you like your future work to be?

17. What do you think you will be?

18. Do you intend to continue your education in the fall?
    a. Yes
    b. No

    If yes, where do you plan to go to school?

    If no, what do you plan to do?

Code__________________
(Leave Blank)

The City College
Office of Research and Evaluation Services

Summer School Program for Junior High
and Intermediate School Pupils-Summer, 1967

Educational Aides Co-ordinator Interview

1. What is your assignment during the regular school year?______________
   Where?________________________ How long?________________________

2. What licenses do you hold?

	Substitute	Regular	Subject
a. Common Branches			
b. Junior High School			
c. High School			
d. Other____________			

3. Briefly describe your job responsibilities for this program.

4. How many Educational Aides were finally placed for use in the program?

TOTAL________
J.H.S. 8____________
54____________
61____________
115____________
136____________
I.S.201____________
258____________

5. In what way were these aides recruited? (Circle one)

   a. Publicity
   b. Places of recruitment
   c. Other________________

6. What criteria did you use for placing an aide in a particular summer school?

7. Was there any special orientation for the Educational Aides?

   a. Yes b. No

   If yes, where was orientation given?

   a. At Board of Education
   b. At placement center
   c. At summer school
   d. At home school
   e. Other____________________

7. Cont'd
   If no, why was there no orientation?

8. Was there any orientation for school personnel (e.g., principal, teachers) regarding use of Educational Aides?

   a. Yes   b. No

   If no, why not?

9. Do you know why there is a difference in pay for Educational Aides in Elementary School and Junior High School?

   a. Yes   b. No

   If yes, why?

10. If you were to continue as co-ordinator next year, what changes would you suggest for the following items?

    a. Recruitment of Educational Aides

    b. Placement of Educational Aides

    c. Publicity

    d. Orientation

    e. Payment

11. What do you consider the major weaknesses of the Educational Aides program?

12. Additional comments:

Code____________
(Leave blank)

THE CITY COLLEGE
Office of Research and Evaluation Services

Summer Program for Junior High and
Intermediate School Pupils - Summer, 1967

Co-ordinator Interview

1. How long have you been the co-ordinator for this program?____________________.

2. What is your assignment during the regular school year?____________________
____.

3. What is your regularly assigned school?______________________________.

4. What are your job responsibilities in ~~your~~ regularly assigned school? ________
____
____
____.

5. Check degrees you hold.

BA - BS______	Major subject area	____________________
MA - MS______		____________________
Ph.d.________		____________________

Partially completed degree____

6. What courses have you taken directly related to the teaching of______________.

	graduate	undergraduate	in-service
a.	________	____________	________
b.	________	____________	________
c.	________	____________	________
d.	________	____________	________

7. What licenses do you hold?

	Regular	Substitute	Subject
a. Common Branches	______	________	______
b. Junior High School	______	________	______
c. High School	______	________	______
d. Other (specify)____________	______	________	______

8. Briefly describe your job responsibilities for this program.

9. Were supplies ordered for the program?
   - a. Yes
   - b. No

If yes, how did you arrive at the selection of materials for the program?

If no, what decision was made as to use of materials, texts, etc.

10. How adequate a supply of materials have you received for the summer program?
    - a. More than adequate
    - b. Adequate
    - c. Less than adequate
    - d. None
    - e. Other

11. Did the materials arrive in time for effective use?
    - a. Yes
    - b. No

12. Were other supplementary materials used besides ones listed in the bulletin?
    - a. Yes
    - b. No

If yes, specify:

13. Did you have the opportunity to visit the schools in the program?
    - a. Yes
    - b. No

If yes, how many?__________

14. Did the teachers discuss the program with you?
    - a. Yes
    - b. No

If yes, how often?
- a. Frequently
- b. Occasionally
- c. Infrequently

And where?
- a. At conferences
- b. At staff meetings
- c. In private conversations
- d. In their classrooms
- e. Other____________________

15. What were the general concerns of the teachers?

16. Have you had any communications with parents or community representatives?
    - a. Yes
    - b. No

If yes, how often?
- a. Frequently
- b. Occasionally
- c. Infrequently

And where?
- a. At individual conferences
- b. Group meetings
- c. Other____________________

At your request?____________ Of their own volition?__________

In response to school initiated meeting?____________

17. Parents' general concerns were: (Circle one)
    - a. Child's behavior
    - b. Child's marks
    - c. Child's future education
    - d. Child's future occupational goals

18. Have there been changes in attitudes of pupils toward learning and school?
    - a. Yes
    - b. No

If yes, have these changes been:
- a. Substantial
- b. Moderate
- c. Slight

19. Are pupil's attitudes:
    - a. Extremely positive
    - b. Positive
    - c. Slightly positive
    - d. Slightly negative
    - e. Negative
    - f. Strongly negative

Why? (d, e, or f)

20. Have there been changes in levels of achievement in________________?
    - a. Yes
    - b. No

If yes, are they	Substantially	Moderately	Slightly
a. Higher	______	______	______
b. Lower	______	______	______

Why?

21. Kindly comment on the following aspects of the summer program giving your opinion of the present program and recommendations for future programs.

    a. Student selection for class placement:

    b. Class size:

    c. School schedule (90 minute periods for students, teachers; lack of teacher preparation period, etc.):

    d. Availability of Special Consultants:

    e. Course of study:

    f. Quality of instruction as evident from observation:

    g. Class trips:

h. Classroom facilities:

i. Pre and Post Testing for the summer school (for Reading--was ITT used?):

j. Other:

22. What do you consider the major strengths of the summer program?

23. What do you consider are the major weaknesses of the summer program?

24. What recommendations would you make to improve the summer program?

25. If the summer program is continued next summer, would you personally like to participate?
    a. Yes
    b. No
    Why?

26. What plans, if any, have been made to insure continuity of the program during the regular school year?

Code________________
(Leave Blank)

THE CITY COLLEGE
Office of Research and Evaluation Services

Summer School Program for Junior High
and Intermediate School Pupils-Summer 1967

Chairman Interview

As you know, we are studying the Summer Program for Junior High and Intermediate School pupils. We would like to ask you a few questions relating to the program. Your answers will be held in strict confidence. Only the project director and his immediate staff will see any record of this interview. Neither you nor your school will ever be identified in any way in our reports.

School____________________________ Borough____________ Date____ Interviewer________

Chairman's name____

(Interviewer fill in) Approximate age____________ M__________ F________

1. What is your regular school assignment?________________

2. How long have you been assigned this position?____________________________

3. Regularly assigned school________________________ Borough____________

4. What did you do before becoming a chairman?______________________________
   Other____
   At what school?______________________________ Where?____________________
   For how long?________________________________

5. Number of pupils currently attending classes in Art_____English_____Music_____
   on register in Art_____English_____Music_____
   Number of pupils that pre-registered in Art_____English_____Music_____.

6. What is the ethnic composition of your school?
   a. Negro________________
   b. Puerto Rican__________
   c. Other________________

7. Describe your job responsibilities (administrative, supervisory, educational) briefly:

8. How adequate a supply of materials have you received? (Circle one)
   a. More than adequate
   b. Adequate
   c. Less than adequate
   d. None

9. Did the materials for pupils arrive in time for effective use?

A. Art	B. Music	C. English
1) Yes	1) Yes	1) Yes
2) No	2) No	2) No

10. To what extent have the Educational Aides been useful?

	Art	Music	English
a. To a great extent	____	____	____
b. To a moderate extent	____	____	____
c. To a slight extent	____	____	____
d. Other	____	____	____

11. In what way are the Educational Aides being utilized?

	Art	Music	English
a. Assisting teacher in whole class instruction	____	____	____
b. Tutoring individual students	____	____	____
c. Assisting with preparation of materials, paperwork	____	____	____
d. Assisting with patrol duty	____	____	____
e. Other	____	____	____

12. What aspects of the summer program would change if no Educational Aides were available?

13. Do the teachers discuss the program with you?
   a. Yes
   b. No

If yes, how often?
   a. Frequently
   b. Occasionally
   c. Infrequently

And where?
   a. At conferences
   b. At staff meetings
   c. In private conversations
   d. Other (specify)________________

14. Have you had any communications with parents or community representatives?
    a. Yes
    b. No

If yes, how often?
    a. Frequently
    b. Occasionally
    c. Infrequently

And where?
    a. At individual conferences
    b. Group meetings
    c. Other________________

At your request?_____ Of their own volition?_____
In response to school initiated meeting?_____

15. Parents' general concerns were: (circle one)
    a. Child's behavior
    b. Child's marks
    c. Child's future education
    d. Child's future occupational goals

16. Have there been changes in attitudes of pupils toward learning and school?
    a. Yes
    b. No

17. If yes, have these changes been:
    a. Substantial
    b. Moderate
    c. Slight

18. Are pupil's attitudes:
    a. Extremely positive
    b. Positive
    c. Slightly positive
    d. Slightly negative
    e. Negative
    f. Strongly negative

Why? (d,e, or f)

In following questions 19 - 24, ask questions in appropriate curriculum area, Art, Music or English.

19. Have there been changes in levels of achievement in Art?
    a. Yes
    b. No

20. If yes, are they	Substantially	Moderately	Slightly
a. Higher	_____	_____	_____
b. Lower	_____	_____	_____

Why?

21. Have there been changes in levels of achievement in Music?
    a. Yes
    b. No

22. If yes, are they

	Substantially	Moderately	Slightly
a. Higher	____	____	____
b. Lower	____	____	____

Why?

23. Have there been changes in levels of achievement in English?
    a. Yes
    b. No

24. If yes are they

	Substantially	Moderately	Slightly
a. Higher	____	____	____
b. Lower	____	____	____

Why?

25. How do *you*, as chairman, rate the following aspects of the summer program?
    0 = No judgment
    1 = Needs to be entirely changed or revised
    2 = Needs considerable improvement
    3 = Basically satisfactory but in need of some improvement
    4 = Very good as is

a. Student selection for program ____
b. Class size ____
c. 90 minute periods ____
d. Selection of students on basis of reading level ____
e. Artists in residence ____
f. Availibility of special consultants (reading guidance, librarian) ____
g. Class trips ____
h. Quality of teacher preparation and participation ____
i. Quality of instruction as evident from observation ____
j. Classroom facilities ____
k. Other________________ ____

26. What do you consider the most valuable contribution of the summer program?

27. What do you consider are the major weaknesses of the summer program?

28. What recommendations would you make to improve the summer program?

29. If the Creative Arts Academy is continued next summer, would you personally like to participate?
    a. Yes
    b. No

    Why?

30. What plans, if any, have been made to insure continuity of the program during the regular school year?

Code____________
(Leave Blank)

THE CITY COLLEGE
Office of Research and Evaluation Services

Summer School Program for Junior High
and Intermediate School Pupils-Summer 1967

Principal's Interview

As you know, we are studying the Summer Program for Junior High and Intermediate School pupils. We would like to ask you a few questions relating to the program. Your answers will be held in strict confidence. Only the project director and his immediate staff will see any record of this interview. Neither you nor your school will ever be identified in any way in our reports.

School_____________________ Borough________ Date_________ Interviewer_______

Principal's name________________

(Interviewer fill in) Approximate age________ M______ F______

1. How long have you been a principal?_____________
2. How long have you been a principal in this summer school?_________
3. Regularly assigned school ____________________ Borough__________
4. What did you do before becoming a principal?_____________________
   At what school?_______________ Where?_______________ For how long?________
5. Number of pupils currently attending school?________ on register?_________
   Number of pupils that pre-registered in reading?_______ in math?_________
   Number of pupils that are attending reading classes currently?__________
   Number of pupils that are attending math classes currently?_____________
6. What is the ethnic composition of your school?
   a. Negro_______
   b. Puerto Rican________
   c. Other_______
7. Describe your job responsibilities (administrative, supervisory, educational) briefly.

Principal's Interview
Cont'd

8. How adequate a supply of reading materials have you received? (Circle one)

   a. More than adequate
   b. Adequate
   c. Less than adequate
   d. None

9. Did the materials of instruction for Reading and Math arrive in time for effective use?

   A. Reading, 1. Yes 2. No; B. Math, 1. Yes 2. No

10. To what extent have the Educational Aides been useful?

	Reading	Math	Other
a. To a great extent	______	____	____
b. To a moderate extent	______	____	____
c. To a slight extent	______	____	____
d. No judgment	______	____	____
e. Other	______	____	____

11. In what way are the Educational Aides being utilized?

	Reading	Math	Other
a. Assisting teacher in whole class instruction	______	____	____
b. Tutoring individual students	______	____	____
c. Assisting with preparation of materials, paperwork	______	____	____
d. Assisting with patrol duty	______	____	____
e. Other	______	____	____

12. What aspects of the summer program would change if no Educational Aides were available?

13. Do the teachers discuss the program with you?

   a. Yes b. No

If yes, How often?

   a. Frequently
   b. Occasionally
   c. Infrequently

And where?

   a. At conferences
   b. At staff meetings
   c. In private conversations
   d. Other (specify)________
   ____

Principal's Interview
Cont'd

14. Have you had any communications with parents or community representatives?
    a. Yes   b. No

If yes, how often?	And where?
a. Frequently	a. At individual conferences
b. Occasionally	b. Group meetings
c. Infrequently	c. Other__________________

At your request?______ Of their own volition?______

In response to school initiated meeting?______

15. Parents' general concerns were: (circle one)

    a. Child's behavior
    b. Child's marks
    c. Child's future education
    d. Child's future occupational goals

16. Have there been changes in attitudes of pupils toward learning and school?

    a. Yes   b. No

17. If yes, have these changes been:

    a. Substantial
    b. Moderate
    c. Slight

18. Are pupil's attitudes:

    a. Extremely positive
    b. Positive
    c. Slightly positive
    d. Slightly negative
    e. Negative
    f. Strongly negative

Why? (d, e, or f)

19. Have there been changes in levels of achievement in Reading?

    a. Yes   b. No

Principal's Interview
Cont'd

20. If yes, are they

	Substantially	Moderately	Slightly
a. Higher	________	________	______
b. Lower	________	________	______

Why?

21. Have there been changes in levels of achievement in Mathematics?

a. Yes b. No

22. If yes, are they

	Substantially	Moderately	Slightly
a. Higher	________	________	______
b. Lower	________	________	______

Why?

23. How do you, the principal, rate the following aspects of the summer program?

0 = No judgment
1 = Needs to be entirely changed or revised
2 = Needs considerable improvement
3 = Basically satisfactory but in need of some improvement
4 = Very good as is

a. Student selection for program ____
b. Class size ____
c. 90 minute periods ____
d. Homogeneous grouping in reading ____
e. Heterogeneous grouping in Math ____
f. Availability of special consultants (reading, guidance, librarian) ____
g. Class trips ____
h. Quality of teacher preparation as evident from plan books ____
i. Quality of instruction as evident from observation ____
j. Classroom facilities ____
k. Other____________ ____

24. What do you consider the most valuable contribution of the summer program?

Principal's Interview
Cont'd

25. What do you consider are the major weaknesses of the summer program?

26. What recommendations would you make to improve the summer program?

27. If the Summer Institute Program is continued next summer, would you personally like to participate?

a. Yes   b. No

Why?

Code_____________
(Leave Blank)

THE CITY COLLEGE
Office of Research and Evaluation Services

Summer School Program for Junior High
and Intermediate School Pupils-Summer 1967

Guidance Counselor Interview

Summer School J.H.S_______Borough______Date_______Interviewer____________

Name____M____F____

School Assignment: J.H.S._____________________________Borough_____________

1. How long have you been a guidance counselor in a summer school?_________ (years)

2. How long have you been a guidance counselor in regular school program?______

3. In what areas do you hold a license?
   Guidance___Regular___Sub___Common Branches___High School____
   Subject areas_________________________

   Years of experience________
     Teacher_________
     Guidance Counselor_______
     Other (specify)_________________________________

4. Describe briefly your job responsibilities for the Summer Institute Program.

5. Are guidance services available to every student? (Circle one)

   1. Yes
   2. No

   If no, specify to whom it is available.

6. How many of the students who should take advantage of the services offered by you do so. (check appropriate responses)

   1. All of them
   2. Most of them
   3. Some of them
   4. Few of them
   5. None

7. How many students have you seen during the summer program.__________
number

8. By whom is the child referred to you? (circle appropriate responses)

   1. Principal
   2. Teachers
   3. Other students
   4. Outside agencies
   5. Parents
   6. Self
   7. Other (specify)

9. In what manner are the pupils seen by you? (circle appropriate responses)

   1. In small groups (2 to 6)
   2. In large groups (6 or more)
   3. As a class
   4. Individually
   5. Other (specify)

10. In what areas did you assist the pupils: (circle appropriate responses)

   1. Educational (course selection, academic problems)
   2. Social problems
   3. Behavorial problems
   4. Emotional problems
   5. Vocational (job placement)
   6. Other (specify)

11. What diagnostic methods have you used? (circle appropriate responses)

   1. Interviewing
   2. Testing
   3. Teacher conferences
   4. Observation
   5. Other (specify)

12. Place a check for each item next to the number of students in whom you viewed a change.

	Most	Many	Few	None	No judgment
1. Attitude toward school					
2. Expectation of success in school					
3. Educational aspirational level					
4. Vocational aspirational level					

13. For those students in whom a change was noticed place a check for each item next to the appropriate direction of change.

	Very positive	Slightly positive	No change	Slightly negative	Very negative	No judgement
1. Attitude toward school						
2. Expectation of success in school						
3. Educational aspiration level						
4 Vocational aspiration level						

14. How many of the students you have seen, seem to have realistic views of themselves, their potentials and aspirations? (circle appropriate responses)

1. All of them do
2. Most "
3. Some "
4. Few "
5. None "

Explain

15. To what extent have you worked with parents?

16. To what extent have you worked with community agencies?

17. What, in your opinion, are the major strengths of the guidance program in the summer school? (Use reverse side if necessary)

B44

(Use reverse side if necessary)

18. What, in your opinion, are the major weaknesses of the guidance program in the summer school?

19. If you had the opportunity to plan another program for the next summer, what changes or recommendations would you make.

20. Additional comments, if any

20. Personal comments of interviewers.

Code____________________
(Leave Blank)

THE CITY COLLEGE
Office of Research and Evaluation Services

Summer School Program for Junior High
and Intermediate School Pupils-Summer 1967

Reading Consultant Interview

Summer School J.H.S.______________Borough___________Date_____Interviewer__________

Name____M____F____

School Assignment: J.H.S.______________________________________Borough__________

1. How long have you been a reading consultant in a summer school?______________
(years)

2. How long have you been a reading consultant in a regular school program?________

3. In what areas do you hold a license? (check one)

Regular_____Sub_____Common Branches_____J.H.S._____High School_____

Subject areas______________

Years of experience_____
Teacher_____ Remedial Reading_____
Reading Consultant_____ Corrective Reading_____
Other (specify)____

4. Describe briefly your job responsibilities for the Summer Institute Program.

5. Are reading consultant services available to every teacher (circle one)

1. Yes
2. No

If no, specify to whom it is available.

6. How many of the teachers take advantage of the services offered by you. (check appropriate responses)

   1. All of them
   2. Most of them
   3. Some of them
   4. Few of them
   5. None

7. Are children referred to you for your help? a) Yes_____ b) No____ (circle one)

   If yes, by whom is the child referred to you? (circle appropriate responses)

   1. Principal
   2. Teachers
   3. Self
   4. Other (specify)

   Briefly, in what areas did you assist the students who were referred to you.

8. In what areas did you assist the teachers? (circle appropriate responses)

   1. Instructional Methods
   2. Preparation of Materials
   3. Diagnosis of Students' Problems
   4. Testing
   5. Other (specify)

9. How adequate was the supply of materials for reading instruction? (circle one)

Scale = 0 = No judgment
1 = Highly adequate
2 = More than adequate
3 = Adequate
4 = Slightly adequate
5 = Inadequate

	IRP	BRP
a. S.R.A. Reading Laboratory 2A	0 1 2 3 4 5	0 1 2 3 4 5
b. Reader's Digest Skill Builder Series	0 1 2 3 4 5	0 1 2 3 4 5
c. Gateway Series	0 1 2 3 4 5	0 1 2 3 4 5
d. Anthology	0 1 2 3 4 5	0 1 2 3 4 5
e. Scholastic Magazine	0 1 2 3 4 5	0 1 2 3 4 5
f. Summertime	0 1 2 3 4 5	0 1 2 3 4 5
g. Reading for Understanding	0 1 2 3 4 5	0 1 2 3 4 5

Comment:

10. How would you rate the effectiveness of the following materials for reading instruction?

Scale = 0 = No judgment
1 = Highly effective
2 = Moderately effective
3 = Effective
4 = Slightly effective
5 = Ineffective

	IRP						BRP					
a. S.R.A. Reading Laboratory 2A	0	1	2	3	4	5	0	1	2	3	4	5
b. Reader's Digest Skill Builder Series	0	1	2	3	4	5	0	1	2	3	4	5
c. Gateway Series	0	1	2	3	4	5	0	1	2	3	4	5
d. Anthology	0	1	2	3	4	5	0	1	2	3	4	5
e. Scholastic Magazine	0	1	2	3	4	5	0	1	2	3	4	5
f. Summertime	0	1	2	3	4	5	0	1	2	3	4	5
g. Reading for Understanding	0	1	2	3	4	5	0	1	2	3	4	5

Comment:

11. Was the library available for use by the students in the reading program? (Circle one)

    1. Yes 2. No

    If yes, in what way was the library used. (Circle appropriate responses)

    1. Students given lessons in library skills
    2. Students allowed to read library books in the library
    3. Students allowed to take library books back to their classes
    4. Other

    To what extent did students use the library? (Circle appropriate responses)

    1. To a great extent
    2. To a moderate extent
    3. To some extent
    4. Not at all

    Comment:

12. Was the library available for use by the teachers in the reading program? (Circle one)

    1. Yes 2. No

    If yes, were teachers able to take out books for use in their classrooms? (Circle one)

    1. Yes 2. No

    To what extent did the teachers take out library books for classroom use? (Circle one)

    1. To a great extent
    2. To a moderate extent
    3. To some extent
    4. Not at all

    Comment:

13. To what extent were books other than instructional materials made available for students' independent reading. (Circle appropriate response)

    1. To a great extent
    2. To a moderate extent
    3. To some extent
    4. Not at all

    Comment:

14. What, in your opinion, are the major strengths of the reading consultant program. (Use reverse side, if necessary for all of the following questions)

15. What, in your opinion, are the major weaknesses of the reading consultant program in the summer school?

16. If you had the opportunity to plan another program of reading consultation for next summer, what changes or recommendations would you make?

17. Additional comments, if any

18. Personal comments of interviewers.

Code______________

THE CITY COLLEGE
Office of Research and Evaluation Services

INDIVIDUAL LESSON OBSERVATION
Summer School Program for Junior High
and Intermediate School Pupils-Summer 1967

INSTRUCTIONS: Please circle the letter or fill in the appropriate responses for the following questions. If choices indicated do not fit particular situation, write in the words DOES NOT APPLY. Particular comments on non-applicable circumstances or any other relevant information would be appreciated on the back of the page.

School________________________ Borough______ Class_____ Grade___ Date____

Teacher's Name__________________ Sex__________ Observer____________________

Length of Observation_______________ Subject Observed: Math ( ) Reading ( )

1. Number of pupils on register (to be obtained from principal)______________.

2. Number of pupils present_________.

3. Portion of lesson observed (circle more than one if relevant):

Reading	Mathematics
a. Pre-session activities	a. Computation (+ - x, etc.)
b. Homework review	b. Sets
c. Skill of the day__________	c. Equations
d. Phonics	d. Other Number bases
e. Directed reading activity	e. Problem solving
f. Other____________________	f. Other____________________

4. List of materials (books, blackboard, etc.) used by teacher for each portion of lesson. (If not relevant, indicate NONE.)

   a.____
   b.____
   c.____
   d.____
   e.____

5. To what extent are classroom displays relevant to the level and studies of the class?
   a. Attractive, creative, with use of student work as well as teacher's and publisher's posters
   b. Attractive with no use of students' own work
   c. Token effort
   d. No effort at all
   e. Other____

JHS IS Summer School Observation

6. To what extent are class activities organized according to a pre-conceived agenda?
   a. Agenda written on blackboard and followed.
   b. Agenda written on blackboard but not followed because of unforeseeable situation.
   c. Agenda written on blackboard but not followed because teacher lacks organization or class discipline.
   d. Agenda not written but a pattern is clearly followed.
   e. No evidence of any organization
   f. Other____.

7. Has the class a code of behavior conducive to learning?
   a. Children orderly because of self-directed interest in learning.
   b. Children orderly because of teacher imposed discipline.
   c. Children talkative but clearly participating in learning process.
   d. Children generally orderly with a few unruly students.
   e. Children quite unruly.

8. What amount of planning and organization was evident in this lesson?
   a. Lesson was exceptionally well organized and planned (aim clearly stated).
   b. Lesson was organized and showed evidence of planning.
   c. Lesson showed some signs of previous teacher preparation but lacked specific organization.
   d. Lesson showed few or no signs of organization planning.

9. To what extent, and how effectively, were teaching aids utilized? (Blackboards, audio-visual aids, role playing, tape recorder, etc.)
   a. Wide variety used and used creatively and effectively.
   b. Wide variety used but not particularly effectively.
   c. Some used and used creatively and effectively.
   d. Some used but not particularly effectively.
   e. Little or no use of teaching aids.

10. To what extent did this lesson refer to earlier material?
    a. Considerable reference to previous lessons (relevant to material in lesson).
    b. Some reference to previous lessons.
    c. No reference to previous lessons.
    d. No reason for reference to earlier material.

11. To what extent did this lesson lay a foundation for future lessons?
    a. Considerable possibility for continuity.
    b. Some opportunity for continuity.
    c. Little or no possibility of continuity.
    d. Little possibility for continuity in the material.

12. To what extent did the teacher relate the child's background and experience to the lesson?
    a. Consistent opportunities for child himself to relate lesson to his own experience and/or bring experience to lesson.
    b. Some opportunity for child himself to relate lesson to his experience and use experience in lesson.
    c. Relation to child's experience came entirely from teacher.
    d. Lesson was remote from the child's experience.
    e. Question not applicable. Explain________________________________

13. Was the pacing of the learning activity appropriate to the work studied and students taught.
    a. Moderately paced so concepts could be thought over.
    b. Sporadic pacing--too long in one area, not long enough in another.
    c. Concepts and drills gone over too quickly for child to grasp.

14. How were Educational Aides used in the classroom?
    a. To help individual students with reading, math.
    b. To help small groups of students.
    c. To give attention to a "problem child."
    d. To mark papers, collect materials, etc.
    e. Given no duties at all.

15. How were the students grouped during the lesson? (Circle more than one if relevant.)
    a. Class as the whole group.
    b. Sub-group (teacher group, independent group, etc.)
    c. Individual instruction.
    d. Independent activities.

16. How would you rate the lesson you have just seen, considering the quality of instruction in reading or in math.
    a. Outstanding
    b. Better than average
    c. Average
    d. Below average
    e. Extremely poor

17. To what extent does the teacher demonstrate she can vary her instruction according to the needs of the individual students.
    a. Extremely flexible and capable.
    b. Tries to vary to some extent.
    c. Makes no effort to provide variation although general teaching remains satisfactory.
    d. Extremely inflexible.

18. To what extent does the teacher encourage pupil questioning, initiative, spontaneity, etc.?
    a. To a great extent throughout lesson.
    b. When the situation calls for it.
    c. To some extent.
    d. Not at all.
    e. Her attitude generally discourages any initiative on part of student.

19. How would you rate the lesson you have just seen, considering the children's interest and enthusiasm? (Children can be interested and listening as well as vocal.)
    a. Outstanding
    b. Better than average
    c. Average
    d. Below average
    e. Extremely poor

20. What was the overall participation of children in lesson?
    a. Every or almost every child was actively involved.
    b. More than half the class participated.
    c. About half of the class participated.
    d. Less than half of the children participated.
    e. Few children participated in the lesson.

21. How would you describe the interaction between teacher and pupils during the lesson?
    a. Lesson teacher dominated.
    b. Little teacher-pupil interaction.
    c. An average of teacher-pupil interaction.
    d. A great deal of teacher-pupil interaction.

22. How many children volunteered in response to teacher questions?
    a. Every or almost every child.
    b. More than half the children.
    c. About half the children.
    d. Less than half the children.
    e. Very few or no volunteering.

23. Give your overall evaluation and comments on the teacher-learning situation. (use reverse side of this page if necessary)

THE CITY COLLEGE
Office of Research and Evaluation Services

Summer School Program for Junior High
and Intermediate School Pupils-Summer 1967

Mrs. Weinberg
368-1100

SCHOOL SCHEDULE

Principal____________________________

School____________________________

Phone Number________________________

Date of Observation____

Schedule For Day____

	Class	Teacher	Room #
Period 1			
Period 2	Educational Aides Interview (Group)		
Period 3			

Schedule for Day____

	Class	Teacher	Room #
Period 1			
Period 2	Educational Aides Interview (Group)		
Period 3			

THE CITY COLLEGE
Office of Research and Evaluation Services

Summer School Program for Junior High
and Intermediate School Pupils-Summer 19677

Mrs. Weinberg
368-1100

SCHOOL SCHEDULE

Principal____________________

School____________________

Phone Number____________________

Date of Observation____________________

Reading Classes to Be Observed____________________

	Class	Teacher	Room #
Period 1	5 Pupil Interviews (in group)		
Period 2	5 Pupil Interviews (in group)		
Period 3	Principal Interviews with both observers		

Math classes to be observed____________________

	Class	Teacher	Room #
Period 1	5 Pupil Interviews (in group)		
Period 2	5 Pupil Interviews (in group)		
Period 3	Principal Interviews with both observers		

B57

Code ____________________
(Leave Blank)

THE CITY COLLEGE
Office of Research and Evaluation Services

Summer School Program for Junior High
and Intermediate School Pupils—Summer 1967

Pupil Post Questionnaire

Name________________________________Male___Female___Summer School_______.

Age______Summer School Class__________Junior High School________________

Borough________________________Grade_______________

1. I went to summer school because (complete the sentence)

2. Are you glad you were in the summer school program? (circle your answer) (write your reasons)

   1. Yes
      Why?

   2. No
      Why?

   3. Other

3. What subjects did you complete this summer? (circle the subjects you have completed)

   1. Art
   2. English Language Arts
   3. English as a second language
   4. Reading
   5. Foreign language
   6. Home Economics
   7. Industrial Arts
   8. Mathematics
   9. Music
   10. Science
   11. Social Studies
   12. Typing

4. Do you think summer school has helped you? (circle your answer)

1. Yes
2. No
3. Don't know

If yes, circle one or more than one reason.

1. Will help me do better in school next year.
2. Will help me get a job.
3. Will help me pass my subjects.
4. Has helped me pass my summer school subjects.
5. Other

If no, I do not think it helped me because (complete the sentence)

5. What subjects did you like the best? (list subjects)

6. What subjects did you learn the most in? (list subjects)

7. What job would you like to have when you finish school?

8. How long would you like to stay in school? (circle your answer)

1. Finish junior high school
2. Finish high school
3. Finish college
4. Until I am 16
5. Other

9. How long do you think you will be able to stay in school? (circle your answer)

1. Finish junior high school
2. Finish high school
3. Finish college
4. Until I am 16
5. Other

10. What job do you think you will have when you leave school? (list jobs)

11. Did you participate in P.A.L. activities during the summer? (circle your answer)

1. Yes
2. No

12. Did you have a summer job? (circle your answer)

1. Yes
2. No

If yes, what do you do?

When?

1. Afternoons
2. After school
3. Weekends

13. Had you ever attended summer session before? (circle your answer)

1. Yes
2. No

When? Year________

Where? School______________________________Borough______________________

What subjects did you take?

14. Would you go to summer school again next year if you could?

1. Yes
2. No

If no, why?

15. What subjects would you like to take? (list subjects)

Code____________
(Leave Blank)

THE CITY COLLEGE
Office of Research and Evaluation Services

Summer School Program for Junior High
and Intermediate School Pupils-Summer 1967

Creative Arts Academy
Pupil Post-Questionnaire

Name_____________________________ Male______ Female_____ Age______

Junior High School_______________ Borough__________ Grade___________

Music -- Band _____________ Orchestra___________ Other______________

1. Are you glad you were in the Creative Arts Academy this summer? (Circle one)

   a. Yes b. No c. Other

   Why?

2. Does anyone in your family have an interest in music, play an instrument?

   a. Yes b. No

   If yes, specify:

3. Have you ever played a musical instrument before?

   a. Yes b. No

   If yes, for how long?___________

   Where?

   a. In school b. Outside school

4. Do you think summer school helped you? (Circle your answer)

   a. Yes b. No

   If yes, in what way?

   If no, I do not think it helped me because (complete the sentence)....

5. How long do you think you'll be able to stay in school? (Circle your answer)

   a. Finish junior high school
   b. Finish high school
   c. Finish college
   d. Until I am 16
   e. Other ________________

6. How long would you like to stay in school? (Circle your answer)

   a. Finish junior high school
   b. Finish high school
   c. Finish college
   d. Until I am 16
   e. Other ________________

7. Have you changed your job plans since attending the Creative Arts Academy this summer?

   a. Yes   b. No

   If yes, what job would you like to have when you finish school?

8. What changes in the summer program would you like to suggest?

9. Would you recommend that the Creative Arts Academy be continued next summer?

   a. Yes   b. No

B63

Code________________
(Leave BlanK)

THE CITY COLLEGE
Office of Research and Evaluation Services

Creative Arts Academy-Summer 1967

Pupil Interview-Discussion Portion

The following are guidelines for a free discussion with pupils you have picked from the classes you have observed, (Art, Dance, English, Music). We are attempting to discover their attitudes toward the Summer Institute Program. (Choose at least five students to interview each day)

1. How do you feel about going to school in the summer? (What do you like, what don't you like, etc.)

2. What did you do in class most of the time?

3. If you were the teacher, what would you have the students do in class?

4. Is summer school different from the regular school? How is it different?

5. Which did you like better: Summer School or Regular School? (Or Neither) Why?

6. Who helped you the most in class?

    a. Teacher
    b. Educational Aide
    c. Guidance Counselor
    d. Department Chairman
    e. Another Student
    f. Other ______________

   How did this person help you?

THE CITY COLLEGE
Office of Research and Evaluation Services

Creative Arts Academy - H. S. of Music & Art

Guidelines for Interviewing Pupils

1. How does student relate to the group?
2. Does the teacher foster a feeling of adequacy?
3. Is the program worthwhile?
4. Has pupil had any outside preparation (art classes, music lessons, etc.)?
5. What is the teacher's role in class?
6. What is the pace of learning?
7. What is the pupil's family backgroumd with respect to the creative arts?
8. What High School is the pupil going to attend in the fall?

THE CITY COLLEGE
Office of Research and Evaluation Services

Creative Arts Academy for Junior High
and Intermediate School Pupils-Summer 1967

Principal____________________ School____________________________

Borough__________ School Phone__________ Schedule_________________

Observers______________________ ____________________

Date of Observation___________

SCHEDULE FOR FIRST DAY

I. Observations:

Name___________________________

Classes to be observed:	Name of Teacher	Period	Room
______________________	_________	1	___
______________________	_________	2	___

Name___________________________

Classes to be observed:	Name of Teacher	Period	Room
______________________	_________	1	___
______________________	_________	2	___

II. Pupil Interviews (Joint)

	Period	Room
5 pupils from _____	1	as designated
5 pupils from _____	1	by school
5 pupils from _____	2	as designated
5 pupils from _____	2	by school

	Period
III. Chairman Interview (Joint)	3

If any questions or problems, call Mrs. Weinberg -- 368 - 1100

B66

Code____________
(Leave Blank)

THE CITY COLLEGE
Office of Research and Evaluation Services

Creative Arts Academy
High School of Music & Art

Teacher Interview

Name______________________________ Date______________

Summer School______________________ Borough___________

Regular School_____________________ Borough___________

Subjects Regularly Taught__________ __________ __________

Summer Class Assignments: ____________ Registers: ____________
(please designate
by school code) ____________ ____________

____________ ____________

1. Please circle or fill in the appropriate response indicating your educational and professional background.

A. Licenses: Early Childhood Common Branches
Junior High School High School
Subjects____________________

B. Teaching Experience: (please indicate number of years)
High School______ Intermediate School______
Junior High______ Elementary School______

C. Teaching Preparation: Regular Teacher Education Program
Intensive Teacher Training Program
Other (specify)____________________

D. Courses taken relating to teaching of Art (circle or fill-in response)

1) Methods of Teaching Art

Circle: Elementary
Junior High School
High School

2) Other ________________________________

____

____

E. **Professional** **Background:**

List type of work in related fields- e.g., advertising, designing, commercial art, etc.

____________________ ____________________

____________________ ____________________

____________________ ____________________

F. **Professional** **Activities:**

List teacher's sctivities in community groups relating to the art field, contributions to the field, involvement with well-known people in field, etc.

____________________ ____________________

____________________ ____________________

____________________ ____________________

____________________ ____________________

2. What is your opinion of the Creative Arts Academy? (circle one)

   a. Needs to be entirely changed or revised
   b. Needs considerable improvement
   c. Basically satisfactory but in need of some improvement
   d. Very good as is

3. Comment on your job responsibilities for the Creative Arts Program?

4. Was there flexibility in planning the course of study for the subject you teach? (circle one)

   a. Yes
   b. No

   If yes, how did you determine what work would be done by the students?

   If no, how was the course of study determined?

5. What were some of the projects your students worked on? (perhaps teacher will show you some samples)

6. Was there opportunity for students to display and/or utilize their work? (circle one)

a. Yes
b. No

If yes, where was work displayed and/or utilized?

a. In class
b. In school
c. In community agencies
d. At a special show
e. Other______________________________

To what extent was pupils' work displayed or utilized?

a. To a great extent
b. To a moderate extent
c. To a slight extent
d. Not at all

7. Please rate the following aspects of the Creative Arts Academy below according to the following scale:

0- no judgement
1- Should be entirely changed or revised
2- Needs considerable revision
3- Basically satisfactory but in need of some improvement
4- Very good as is
X- Does not apply

a. Class size ______
b. 90 minute periods ______
c. Use of Educational Aides ______
d. Organization of program within school ______
e. Availability of special consultants ______
f. Instructional program ______
g. Classroom facilities ______
h. Materials of instruction ______
i. Class trips ______
j. Communication between school staff, specialists, etc. ______
k. Other______________ ______

Comments:

8. To what extent have the Educational Aides been useful? (circle one)

a. To a great extent
b. To a moderate extent
c. To a slight extent
d. No judgement
e. Other______________________________

9. In what way were the Educational Aides utilized? (circle one)

a. Assisting teacher in whole class instruction
b. Assisting individual students
c. Assisting with preparation of materials
d. Assisting with patrol duty
e. Other________________________________

10. What aspects of the Creative Arts Program would change if no Educational Aides were available?

11. Has the Creative Arts Academy benefited the students you have taught? (circle one)

a. Yes
b. No

If yes, how has it helped?

12. What do you consider the major strengths of the Cr .ve Arts Academy?

13. What do you consider the major weaknesses ne Creative Arts Academy?

14. What recommendations would you make to improve the program?

15. Additional comments:

Appendix C

Staff List

Dr. David J. Fox, Associate Professor
Director, Office of Research and Evaluation Services
Chairman, Department of Social and Psychological Foundations
College of the City of New York

Mrs. Emmeline Weinberg, Lecturer
School of Education
College of the City of New York

Miss Linda Curtis, Research Assistant

Mr. Robert Fischer, Research Assistant

Miss Roberta Jellinek, Research Assistant

Observers and Consultants

Mr. Michael Bartos
Conductor
New York Symphony

Dr. Augustine Brezina
Assistant Professor
School of Education
The City College

Dr. Joseph Canimo
Assistant Professor
Art Department
New York University

Dr. Harold Davis
Assistant Professor
School of Education
The City College

Dr. Harwood Fisher
Assistant Professor
School of Education
The City College

Dr. William Greenstadt
Assistant Professor
School of Education
The City College

Mr. Robert Grossman
Consultant in Art

Miss Thelma Hill
Supervisor, Dance Program
HARYOU-ACT

Dr. Anthony Jansic
Associate Professor
School of Education
The City College

Dr. Elayne Kahn
Instructor
School of Education
The City College

Dr. Julius Paster
Associate Professor
School of Education
The City College

Mrs. Joan Raim
Lecturer
School of Education
The City College

Dr. Julius Rosen
Assistant Professor
School of Education
The City College

Dr. Sol Schwartz
Assistant Professor
School of Education
The City College

Dr. Theresa Woodruff
Associate Professor
School of Education
The City College

Mr. Mark Zalk
Scholar in Residence: Drama
Bennington College